Emil Schürer, Charles Scribner's Sons

# A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ

# A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ

Emil Schürer, Charles Scribner's Sons

BIBLIOLIFE

**Copyright © BiblioLife, LLC**

This book represents a historical reproduction of a work originally published before 1923 that is part of a unique project which provides opportunities for readers, educators and researchers by bringing hard-to-find original publications back into print at reasonable prices. Because this and other works are culturally important, we have made them available as part of our commitment to protecting, preserving and promoting the world's literature. These books are in the "public domain" and were digitized and made available in cooperation with libraries, archives, and open source initiatives around the world dedicated to this important mission.

We believe that when we undertake the difficult task of re-creating these works as attractive, readable and affordable books, we further the goal of sharing these works with a global audience, and preserving a vanishing wealth of human knowledge.

Many historical books were originally published in small fonts, which can make them very difficult to read. Accordingly, in order to improve the reading experience of these books, we have created "enlarged print" versions of our books. Because of font size variation in the original books, some of these may not technically qualify as "large print" books, as that term is generally defined; however, we believe these versions provide an overall improved reading experience for many.

# A HISTORY

OF

# THE JEWISH PEOPLE

## IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST.

BY

EMIL SCHÜRER, D.D., M.A.,
PROFESSOR OF THEOLOGY AT THE UNIVERSITY OF GIESSEN.

*Being a Second and Revised Edition of a "Manual of the History of New Testament Times."*

Second Division.

THE INTERNAL CONDITION OF PALESTINE, AND OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE, IN THE TIME OF JESUS CHRIST.

TRANSLATED BY

SOPHIA TAYLOR AND REV. PETER CHRISTIE.

VOL. II.

NEW YORK:
CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS.
1891.

THE PORTIONS OF THE TRANSLATORS RESPECTIVELY ARE—

By Miss Taylor.

Vol. I. pages 1–149, and page 306 to end.
Vol. II. pages 1–242.

By Rev. Peter Christie.

Vol. I. pages 150–305.
Vol. II. page 243 to end.

---

The Sections run on from the First Division, which, as explained in the Preface, is in preparation.

Volume III., completing this Division, is in the press.

# CONTENTS OF DIVISION II. VOL. II.


PAGE

§ 26. PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES. . . . . 4
I. The Pharisees, . . . . . 12
II. The Sadducees, . . . . . 29

§ 27. SCHOOL AND SYNAGOGUE, . . . . . 44
I. The School, . . . . . 46
II. The Synagogue, . . . . . 52
Organization of the Community, 55. Officers, 62. Buildings, 68. Order of Divine Worship, 75.
Appendix.—The Shemah and Shemoneh Esreh, . . 83

§ 28. LIFE UNDER THE LAW, . . . . . 90
I. General Observations, . . . . . 90
II. The Sanctification of the Sabbath, . . . . 96
III. Laws concerning Cleanness and Uncleanness, . . . 106
IV. Externalism of Religion, . . . . . 111
V. Errors, . . . . . 120

§ 29. THE MESSIANIC HOPE, . . . . . 126
I. Relation to the older Messianic Hope, . . . . 129
II. Historical Survey, . . . . . 137
III. Systematic Statement, . . . . . 154
Last Tribulation and Perplexity, 154. Elias as the Forerunner, 156. The Appearing of the Messiah, 158. Last Attack of the Hostile Powers, 164. Destruction of the Hostile Powers, 165. Renovation of Jerusalem, 168. Gathering of the Dispersed, 169. The Kingdom of Glory in Palestine, 170. Renovation of the World, 177. The General Resurrection, 179. The Last Judgment, Eternal Salvation and Condemnation, 181.
Appendix.—The Suffering Messiah, . . . . 184

PAGE

§ 30. The Essenes, . . . . . 188

I. The Facts, . . . . . 192

Organization of the Community, 192. Ethics—Manners and Customs, 198. Theology and Philosophy, 202.

II. Nature and Origin of Essenism, . . . . 205

§ 31. Judaism in the Dispersion—Proselytes, . . . 219

I. Extension, 220. Lands of the Euphrates, 223. Syria and Asia Minor, 225. Egypt, 226. Cyrenaica, 231. Greece and the Islands, 232. Italy, 232.

II. Constitution of the Communities, . . . . 243

1. Internal Organization, . . . . . 243

2. Political Position, . . . . . 252

III. Equality in regard to the Rights of Citizenship, . . 270

IV. Religious Life, . . . . . 281

V. The Proselytes, . . . . . 291

Different Kinds, 311. Proselytes of the Gate, 316. Baptism of Proselytes, 319.

## § 26. PHARISEES AND SADDUCEES.

### The Literature.


For the older literature, see Carpzov, *Apparatus hist.-crit.* pp. 173, 204, and Daniel, art. "Pharisäer," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encyclopädie*, § 3, vol. xxii. p. 18.

Triglandius, *Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma, in quo Serarii, Drusii, Scaligeri opuscula quae eo pertinent cum aliis junctim exhibentur.* 2 vols. Delphis 1703.

Ugolini, *Trihaeresium sive dissertatio de tribus sectis Judaeorum* (*Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, tom. xxii.; and other dissertations therein).

Joh. Gottlob Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp. 173–215.

Grossmann, *De Judaeorum disciplina arcana.* Part i.–ii. Lips. 1833–1834. The same, *De philosophia Sadducaeorum.* Part i.–iv. Lips. 1836–1838. The same, *De Pharisaeismo Judaeorum Alexandrino.* Part i.–iii. Lips. 1846–1850. The same, *De collegio Pharisaeorum.* Lips. 1851.

Daniel, art. "Pharisäer," in Ersch and Gruber, *Allgemeine Encyklop. der Wissensch. und Künste*, § 3, vol. xxii. (1846) pp. 17–34.

Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 244–248 (Pharisäer), and 352–356 (Sadducäer).

Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, i. (1852) pp. 157–222.

Reuss in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xi. 1859, pp. 496–509 (Pharisäer), and xiii. 1860, pp. 289–297 (Sadducäer).

Müller (Alois), *Pharisäer und Sadducäer oder Judaismus und Mosaismus. Eine historisch-philosophische Untersuchung als Beitrag zur Religionsgeschichte Vorderasiens* (*Report of the Session of the Viennese Academy, phil.-hist. class*, vol. xxxiv. 1860, pp. 95–164).

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, iv. 357 sqq., 476 sqq.

De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüdischen Archäologie* (4th ed.), pp. 413–417.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 356 sqq., 382 sqq.

Jost, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, i. 197 sqq., 216 sqq.

Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 101–158. The same, *Sadducäer und Pharisäer* (*Jud. Zeitschr.* vol. ii. 1863, pp. 11–54.

Also printed separately). The same, *Das Judenthum und seine Geschichte*, Part i. (2nd ed. 1865) p. 86 sqq.

Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. iii. (3rd ed. 1878) pp. 91 sqq., 647–657 (note 10).

Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 75–78, 119–144, 452–456.

Hanne, *Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer als politische Parteien* (*Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1867, pp. 131–179, 239–263).

Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 250–282.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 124–135.

Hausrath in *d. Prot. Kirchenzeitung*, 1862, Nr. 44. The same, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. 117–132. The same in Schenkel's *Bibellexikon*, iv. 518–529.

Ginsburg, arts. "Pharisees" and "Sadducees," in *Kitto's Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.

Twisleton, the same article in *Smith's Dictionary of the Bible*.

Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israel*, ii. 338–371, 456 sqq. The same, *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 632–650 (advertisement of Wellhausen's work).

Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer. Eine Untersuchung zur inneren jüdischen Geschichte.* Greifswald 1874.

Cohen, *Les Pharisiens.* 2 vols. Paris 1877.

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie.* Leipzig 1880.

Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 396, 546, 548–554.

Baneth, *Ueber den Ursprung der Sadokäer und Boethosäer* (*Magazin für die Wissensch. des Judenth.* Jahrg. ix. 1882, pp. 1–37, 61–95. Also separately as a Leipsic doctorial dissertation).

Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883) pp. 1038–1059 (art. "Sadducäer," etc. Comp. also the articles: "Amhaarez," "Chaber," "Chassidim," "Zaddikim").

Montet, *Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien et leur histoire jusqu'à la naissance de Jésus-Christ.* Paris 1883 (comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1883, p. 169).

Sieffert, art. "Sadducäer" and "Pharisäer," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xiii. 1884, pp. 210–244.

## *The Testimony of Josephus.*

*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14: Φαρισαῖοι μὲν οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα καὶ τὴν πρώτην ἀπάγοντες αἵρεσιν, εἱμαρμένῃ τε καὶ θεῷ προσάπτουσι πάντα, καὶ τὸ μὲν

πράττειν τὰ δίκαια καὶ μὴ κατὰ τὸ πλεῖστον ἐπὶ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις κεῖσθαι, βοηθεῖν δὲ εἰς ἕκαστον καὶ τὴν εἱμαρμένην· ψυχὴν δὲ πᾶσαν μὲν ἄφθαρτον, μεταβαίνειν δὲ εἰς ἕτερον σῶμα τὴν τῶν ἀγαθῶν μόνην, τὴν δὲ τῶν φαύλων ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ κολάζεσθαι. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ, τὸ δεύτερον τάγμα, τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην παντάπασιν ἀναιροῦσι, καὶ τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ δρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ ἐφορᾶν τίθενται, φασὶ δὲ ἐπ' ἀνθρώπων ἐκλογῇ τό τε καλὸν καὶ τὸ κακὸν προκεῖσθαι, καὶ τὸ κατὰ γνώμην ἑκάστῳ τούτων ἑκατέρῳ προσιέναι. Ψυχῆς δὲ τὴν διαμονὴν καὶ τὰς καθ' Ἅιδου τιμωρίας καὶ τιμὰς ἀναιροῦσι. Καὶ Φαρισαῖοι μὲν φιλάλληλοί τε καὶ τὴν εἰς τὸ κοινὸν ὁμόνοιαν ἀσκοῦντες, Σαδδουκαίων δὲ καὶ πρὸς ἀλλήλους τὸ ἦθος ἀγριώτερον, αἵ τε ἐπιμιξίαι πρὸς τοὺς ὁμοίους ἀπηνεῖς ὡς πρὸς ἀλλοτρίους.

*Antt.* xiii. 5. 9 : Κατὰ δὲ τὸν χρόνον τοῦτον τρεῖς αἱρέσεις τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἦσαν, αἳ περὶ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων διαφόρως ὑπελάμβανον· ὧν ἡ μὲν Φαρισαίων ἐλέγετο, ἡ δὲ Σαδδουκαίων, ἡ τρίτη δὲ Ἐσσηνῶν. Οἱ μὲν οὖν Φαρισαῖοι τινὰ καὶ οὐ πάντα τῆς εἱμαρμένης εἶναι λέγουσιν ἔργον, τινὰ δ' ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς ὑπάρχειν, συμβαίνειν τε καὶ μὴ γίνεσθαι. Τὸ δὲ τῶν Ἐσσηνῶν γένος πάντων τὴν εἱμαρμένην κυρίαν ἀποφαίνεται, καὶ μηδὲν ὃ μὴ κατ' ἐκείνης ψῆφον ἀνθρώποις ἀπαντᾷ. Σαδδουκαῖοι δὲ τὴν μὲν εἱμαρμένην ἀναιροῦσιν, οὐδὲν εἶναι ταύτην ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ κατ' αὐτὴν τὰ ἀνθρώπινα τέλος λαμβάνειν, ἅπαντα δ' ἐφ' ἡμῖν αὐτοῖς τίθενται, ὡς καὶ τῶν ἀγαθῶν αἰτίους ἡμᾶς αὐτοὺς γινομένους καὶ τὰ χείρω παρὰ ἡμετέραν ἀβουλίαν λαμβάνοντας.

*Antt.* xiii. 10. 5 : [Οἱ Φαρισαῖοι] τοσαύτην ἔχουσι τὴν ἰσχὺν παρὰ τῷ πλήθει ὡς καὶ κατὰ βασιλέως τι λέγοντες καὶ κατ' ἀρχιερέως εὐθὺς πιστεύεσθαι.

*Antt.* xiii. 10. 6 : Ἄλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

*Ibid.*: Νόμιμα πολλά τινα παρέδοσαν τῷ δήμῳ οἱ Φαρισαῖοι ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς, ἅπερ οὐκ ἀναγέγραπται ἐν τοῖς Μωϋσέως

νόμοις, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ταῦτα τὸ Σαδδουκαίων γένος ἐκβάλλει, λέγον ἐκεῖνα δεῖν ἡγεῖσθαι νόμιμα τὰ γεγραμμένα, τὰ δ' ἐκ παραδόσεως τῶν πατέρων μὴ τηρεῖν. Καὶ περὶ τούτων ζητήσεις αὐτοῖς καὶ διαφορὰς γενέσθαι συνέβαινε μεγάλας, τῶν μὲν Σαδδουκαίων τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἑπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἐχόντων, τῶν δὲ Φαρισαίων τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἐχόντων.

*Antt.* xvii. 2. 4: Ἦν γὰρ μόριόν τι Ἰουδαϊκῶν ἀνθρώπων ἐπ' ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου, αὐτοῖς χαίρειν τὸ θεῖον προσποιουμένων, οἷς ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνῖτις· Φαρισαῖοι καλοῦνται, βασιλεῦσι δυνάμενοι μάλιστα ἀντιπράσσειν, προμηθεῖς, κἀκ τοῦ προύπτου εἰς τὸ πολεμεῖν τε καὶ βλάπτειν ἐπηρμένοι.[1]

*Antt.* xviii. 1, 2: Ἰουδαίοις φιλοσοφίαι τρεῖς ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ πάνυ ἀρχαίου τῶν πατρίων, ἥ τε τῶν Ἐσσηνῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν Σαδδουκαίων· τρίτην δὲ ἐφιλοσόφουν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι λεγόμενοι. Καὶ τυγχάνει μέντοι περὶ αὐτῶν ἡμῖν εἰρημένα ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ βίβλῳ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊκοῦ πολέμου, μνησθήσομαι δὲ ὅμως καὶ νῦν αὐτῶν ἐπ' ὀλίγον.

§ 3: Οἵ τε γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι τὴν δίαιταν ἐξευτελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες, ὧν τε ὁ λόγος κρίνας παρέδωκεν ἀγαθῶν, ἔπονται τῇ ἡγεμονίᾳ, περιμάχητον ἡγούμενοι τὴν φυλακὴν ὧν ὑπαγορεύειν ἠθέλησε. Τιμῆς γε τοῖς ἡλικίᾳ προήκουσι παραχωροῦσιν, οὐδὲν ἐπ' ἀντιλέξει τῶν εἰσηγηθέντων ταῦτα θράσει ἐπαιρόμενοι. Πράσσεσθαί τε εἱμαρμένῃ τὰ πάντα ἀξιοῦντες, οὐδὲ τοῦ ἀνθρωπείου τὸ βουλόμενον τῆς ἐπ' αὐτοῖς ὁρμῆς ἀφαιροῦνται, δοκῆσαν τῷ θεῷ κρᾶσιν γενέσθαι καὶ τῷ ἐκείνης βουλευτηρίῳ καὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων τὸ θελῆσαν προσχωρεῖν μετ' ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας. Ἀθάνατόν τε ἰσχὺν ταῖς ψυχαῖς πίστις αὐτοῖς εἶναι, καὶ ὑπὸ χθονὸς δικαιώσεις τε καὶ

[1] These words of hostility to the Pharisees are evidently not the production of Josephus, but copied by him from Nikolaus Damascenus (comp. Derenbourg, p. 123, note). They are the more valuable as a corrective to the flatteringly coloured representation of Josephus.

τιμὰς αἷς ἀρετῆς ἢ κακίας ἐπιτήδευσις ἐν τῷ βίῳ γέγονε, καὶ ταῖς μὲν εἰργμὸν ἀΐδιον προτίθεσθαι, ταῖς δὲ ῥᾳστώνην τοῦ ἀναβιοῦν. Καὶ δι' αὐτὰ τοῖς τε δήμοις πιθανώτατοι τυγχάνουσι, καὶ ὁπόσα θεῖα εὐχῶν τε ἔχεται καὶ ἱερῶν ποιήσεως ἐξηγήσει τῇ ἐκείνων τυγχάνουσι πρασσόμενα. Εἰς τοσόνδε ἀρετῆς αὐτοῖς αἱ πόλεις ἐμαρτύρησαν ἐπιτηδεύσει τοῦ ἐπὶ πᾶσι κρείσσονος ἔν τε τῇ διαίτῃ τοῦ βίου καὶ λίγοις.

§ 4: Σαδδουκαίοις δὲ τὰς ψυχὰς ὁ λόγος συναφανίζει τοῖς σώμασι, φυλακῆς δὲ οὐδαμῶν τινῶν μεταποίησις αὐτοῖς ἢ τῶν νόμων· πρὸς γὰρ τοὺς διδασκάλους σοφίας ἣν μετίασιν, ἀμφιλογεῖν ἀρετὴν ἀριθμοῦσιν. Εἰς ὀλίγους τε ἄνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρώτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι, πράσσεταί τε ὑπ' αὐτῶν οὐδὲν ὡς εἰπεῖν· ὁπότε γὰρ ἐπ' ἀρχὰς παρέλθοιεν, ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας, προσχωροῦσι δ' οὖν οἷς ὁ Φαρισαῖος λέγει, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἂν ἄλλως ἀνεκτοὺς γενέσθαι τοῖς πλήθεσιν.

*Antt.* xx. 9. 1: αἵρεσιν δὲ μετῄει τὴν Σαδδουκαίων οἵπερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὠμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους, καθὼς ἤδη δεδηλώκαμεν.

*Vita*, 2, *fin.*: ἠρξάμην πολιτεύεσθαι τῇ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσει κατακολουθῶν, ἣ παραπλήσιός ἐστι τῇ παρ' Ἕλλησι Στωικῇ λεγομένῃ.

*Vita*, 38: τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσεως, οἳ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβείᾳ διαφέρειν.

## THE TESTIMONY OF THE MISHNA.

### (*a*) *On Perushim and Zaddukim.*

*Jadajim* iv. 6: "The Zaddukim said to the Perushim: We must blame you, Perushim, for maintaining that the Holy Scriptures defile the hands, while antagonistic books (ספרי המירם or perhaps ספרי המירם = the books of Homer) do not defile the hands. To this Rabban Johanan ben Sakkai replied: Is this then the only thing of the kind, for which the Perushim can be reproached? They also say: The bones of an ass are clean, and

those of the high priest Johanan unclean. To which they replied: Bones are declared unclean according to the proportion of affection, lest perhaps some one should make spoons of the bones of his father or his mother. Hereupon he replied: So too is it with the Holy Scriptures only a proof of affection, when it is declared that they defile the hands, while antagonistic books (the books of Homer) are not loved, and therefore contact with them does not defile."

*Ibid.* iv. 7: "The Zaddukim said also: We must blame you, Perushim, for declaring what is poured into an unclean vessel to be clean. The Perushim replied: We must blame you, Zaddukim, for declaring a channel coming out of a burying-place to be clean. The Zaddukim also said: We must blame you, Perushim, for saying: If my ox or my ass does harm, I owe compensation; and if my man-servant or my maid-servant does harm, I am free. If I must pay compensation for an ox or an ass, to whom I have no legal obligations, why should I not owe compensation for what my man-servant and maid-servant do, to whom I have legal obligations? They replied: That which applies to an ox and an ass, which have no reason, cannot apply to a man-servant or maid-servant, who has reason. For else they might, if I make them angry, set fire to the field of another, and force me to pay expenses."

*Ibid.* iv. 8: "A Galilaean heretic[2] once said: I blame you, Perushim, for writing in a writing of divorcement the name of the governor with that of Moses. The Perushim answered: We must blame thee, Galilaean heretic, for nevertheless writing the name of the governor and the name of God upon one page, and besides this the former above and the latter below. For it is written in the Bible (Ex. v. 2): *Pharaoh* said: Who is *Jahveh*, that I should obey Him and let Israel go?"

*Chagiga* ii. 7: "The garments of Am-haarez are Midras (מִדְרָס, that is, defiled by pressure) for Perushim; those of the Perushim are Midras for those who eat the heave; those of the latter are Midras for those who eat holy things; and those of the latter are Midras for those who sprinkle the water of purification."[3]

---

[2] According to the best authorities (*Cod. de Rossi* 138, Cambridge MS., *editio princeps of the Mishna*, 1492), the reading here and further on should be צדוקי גלילי instead of מין גלילי.

[3] On the meaning of Am-haarez (עם הארץ), see farther on. "Those who eat the heave" are the priests and those belonging to them, "those who eat the holy things" are the ministering priests. Each subsequent category stands a degree higher in holiness and purity than the preceding one, on which account the garments of the preceding are unclean and unlawful for them;

*Sota* iii. 4: "R. Joshua used to say: A foolish saint, a wise sinner, a *Pharisaic* woman (אִשָּׁה פְּרוּשָׁה) and the sufferings of Perushim destroy the world."[4]

*Erubin* vi. 2: "Rabban Gamaliel relates: A *Zadduki* once lived with us in a Maboi (a street fenced off for the purpose of freer Sabbath intercourse) in Jerusalem. Then my father said: Bring quickly all your goods into the Maboi, before the Zadduki can bring anything there, and make it unlawful for you. R. Judah quotes the saying differently: Do quickly what you have to do in the Maboi before the Zadduki brings anything there, and makes it unlawful for you."[5]

*Makḳoth* i. 6: "False witnesses are only to be executed, when sentence has been passed upon one found guilty through them. The Zaddukim say: Only when he has been already executed; because it is said (Deut. xix. 21), life for life. But the learned have refuted this, because it is said (Deut. xix. 19) you shall do to him as he thought to do to his brother. His brother therefore still exists."

In *Para* iii. 3 the ordinary printed text has only צדוקים. Better authorities have מינים.[6]

*Para* iii. 7: "The priests who burned the red heifer, were purposely declared unclean on account of the Zaddukim, that they might not assert, that the heifer was prepared by such only as had become clean through the setting of the sun."

---

comp. in illustration, Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* מדרם (iii. 33 sq.), and the translation in the Mishna published under Jost's direction.

[4] The meaning seems to be, that the world cannot continue with a combination of irreconcilable contrasts. Expositors indeed explain it differently. See Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 218 sqq.

[5] The explanation of the difficult Mishna is doubtful, and the difficulty is increased by the uncertainty of the reading in the last sentence (see the note in Jost's *Mishna*, and the commentary in Surenhusius, ii. 108 sq.). At all events however Gamaliel means, according to the first reported form of his speech, to say, that his father placed the Zadduki on a level with another (rigidly legal) Israelite. For when several Israelites *jointly* deposited anything before the beginning of the Sabbath in a space fenced off, on which their houses abutted, they thereby made this space their private tenement, within which it was lawful even on the Sabbath to carry in and out. Those however who had taken no part in such depositing were excluded from this privilege.

[6] So *Cod. de Rossi* 138, the Cambridge MS., and the *editio princeps of the Mishna* (Naples 1492).

*Nidda* iv. 2: "The daughters of the Zaddukim are, if they walk in the ways of their fathers, equal to Samaritan women. If they walk openly in the ways of Israel, they are equal to Israelitish women. R. Joses says: They are all looked upon as Israelitish women, unless it is proved that they walk in the ways of their fathers."

### (*b*) *On Chaber and Am-haarez.*

*Demai* ii. 3: "He who takes upon himself to be a Chaber (חָבֵר) sells neither fresh nor dry fruits to the Am-haarez (עַם הָאָרֶץ), buys from them no fresh, does not enter their houses as a guest, nor receive them as guests within his walls. R. Judah says: He must also breed no small cattle,[7] not be frivolous in oaths and jokes, not defile himself with the dead, must on the other hand wait in the school-house. He was however answered: All this does not amount to the main thing."

*Demai* vi. 6: "If a Chaber and an Am-haarez inherit from their father, who was an Am-haarez, the former may say: Do thou take the wheat in this place and I will take the wheat in that place, thou the wine of this, I of that place. But he may not say to him: Do thou take wheat and I barley; thou the moist, I the dry."[8]

*Demai* vi. 12: "If an Am-haarez says to a Chaber: Buy me a bundle of vegetables, buy me a loaf, the latter may buy without special remark and is free from the duty of tithing. But if he added: I buy this for myself and that for my friend, and they get mixed, he must tithe all, even if the latter were a hundred (*i.e.* a hundred times as great as his own)."

*Shebiith* v. 9 = *Gittin* v. 9: "One woman may lend to another, who is suspected about shebiith (the eating of the fruits of the seventh year), a flour sieve, a corn sieve, a hand mill and a stove, but may not help her to gather or to grind. The wife of a Chaber may lend the wife of an Am-haarez a flour sieve and a corn sieve, and may also help her to gather, to grind and to winnow. But when once water has been poured on the flour she may no longer handle it with her,[9] for one must not assist the

---

[7] Because shepherds do not spare their neighbour's field.

[8] This is in the interest of the correct tithing of all the different crops by the Chaber.

[9] The reason of this is found in the laws concerning clean and unclean. See the commentary.

transgressor. Besides, this latter has been only allowed for the sake of peace, just as one may in the seventh year wish success to the labour of the Gentiles, but not to that of an Israelite, etc."

*Bikkurim* iii. 12: "R. Judah says: A priest may make a present of the first-fruits only to a Chaber."

*Tohoroth* vii. 4: "If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding at the mill in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; but if it goes on grinding, only that is unclean which the woman could reach by stretching out her hand. If there are two such women there, all is, according to R. Meir, unclean, because while the one is grinding, the other can touch everything, but according to the learned, only that which each could touch by stretching out her hand."

*Tohoroth* viii. 5: "If the wife of an Am-haarez enters the house of a Chaber to fetch out his son, his daughter, or his cattle, the house remains clean, because she has no permission to stay there."

The *priests* and *scribes* were the two influential factors which determined the inner development of Israel after the captivity. In Ezra's time they were still virtually identical. From the commencement of the Greek period they were more and more separated, and about the period of the Maccabaean conflict two parties sharply contrasted with each other were developed from them. The *Sadducean* party proceeded from the ranks of the priests, the party of the *Pharisees* from the scribes. We know these two parties from the testimony especially of the New Testament and Josephus as two circles in hostile opposition to each other. But we shut out beforehand the comprehension of their nature, if we view the contrast between the two as one really the result of opinion. The Pharisees were by nature *the rigidly legal*, the Sadducees in the first instance only the *aristocrats*, who certainly were driven by the historical development into that opposition to Pharisaic legality, which however formed no fundamental element of their nature. Hence we gain but a distorted image by opposing the differences between them to each other point by point. On the contrary, the characteristic feature of the

Pharisees arises from their *legal tendency*, that of the *Sadducees* from their *social position.*[10]

### I. THE PHARISEES.

The Pharisees were simply those who were specially exact about the interpretation and observance of the law, hence they were the *rigidly legal*, who spared themselves no pains and privations in its punctual fulfilment. "They were considered to interpret the law with accuracy."[11] "They valued themselves upon their accurate interpretation of the law of their fathers."[12] "They renounce the enjoyments of life and in nothing surrender themselves to comfort."[13] Hence they were those, who seriously and consistently strove to carry out in practice the ideal of a legal life set up by the scribes. And this is to say, that they were the *classic representatives of that tendency, which the internal development of Israel altogether adopted during the post-exilian period.* What applies to this in general applies in a specific manner to the Pharisaic party. It was the germ proper, which was distinguished from the rest of the mass only by its greater strictness and consistency. Hence the law, in that maturity of complication which had been given to it by the labours of the scribes during the course of centuries, was the basis of all its efforts. To carry this out in every point was the beginning and end of all its endeavours. Hence all that has been said above (§ 25. III.)

[10] The above expressed thought, that the contrast between the two was not one of opinion, was first precisely formulated by Wellhausen.

[11] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14: οἱ δοκοῦντες μετ' ἀκριβείας ἐξηγεῖσθαι τὰ νόμιμα· *Vita*, 38: οἱ περὶ τὰ πάτρια νόμιμα δοκοῦσι τῶν ἄλλων ἀκριβεία διαφέρειν Comp. Acts xxii. 3, xxvi. 5; Phil. iii. 5.

[12] *Antt.* xvii. 2. 4: ἐπ' ἐξακριβώσει μέγα φρονοῦν τοῦ πατρίου νόμου.

[13] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3: τὴν δίαιταν ἐξεντελίζουσιν, οὐδὲν εἰς τὸ μαλακώτερον ἐνδιδόντες.

on the development of Jewish law by the labours of the scribes, and all that will be adduced farther on (§ 28) on the nature of Jewish legalism, serves to characterize Pharisaism. The legalism there described is just the Pharisaic. But as Pharisaism rests upon the foundation of the law as developed by the scribes, so did it also in its turn govern the farther development of Jewish law. When the Pharisaic party had once been formed as such, all the more famous scribes, at least all those who influenced the future development, proceeded from its midst. There were indeed Sadducean scribes. But their work has left no trace behind it in history. All the influential scribes belonged to the Pharisaic party. This may be assumed as self-evident, and is confirmed by the fact, that in the few cases in which the party position of the scribes is named, they are as a rule designated as Pharisees.[14]

After what has been said, it is self-evident, that the Pharisees would declare not only the written Thorah, but also the "oral law" developed by the scribes as binding. This whole multitude of enactments now passed as the correct exposition and further development of the written Thorah. Zeal for the one implied zeal for the other. Hence it is expressly said in Josephus, "*The Pharisees have imposed upon the people many laws taken from the tradition of the fathers* (ἐκ πατέρων διαδοχῆς), *which are not written in the law of Moses.*[15] When John Hyrcanus forsook the Pharisees, he abolished the laws which they had introduced κατὰ τὴν πατρῴαν παράδοσιν, and at the restoration under Alexandra they were re-enacted.[16] In the New Testament also testimony is given to the estimation in which the Pharisees held the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων (Mark vii. 3; Matt. xv. 2). That the same

[14] *Antt.* xv. 1. 1: Πωλίων ὁ Φαρισαῖος καὶ Σαμέας ὁ τούτου μαθητής. Also *Antt.* xv. 10. 4. Acts v. 34: τὶς ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ Φαρισαῖος ὀνόματι Γαμαλιήλ. Joseph. *Vita*, 38: ὁ δὲ Σίμων οὗτος ἦν πόλεως μὲν Ἱεροσολύμων, γένους δὲ σφόδρα λαμπροῦ, τῆς δὲ Φαρισαίων αἱρέσεως.

[15] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6.

[16] *Antt.* xiii. 16. 2.

standpoint with regard to this παράδοσις was represented by the entire body of Jewish Rabbinism has already been shown (vol. i. p. 334 sq.). The Halacha or traditional law, as developed and settled by the labours of the scribes, was declared to be as legally binding as the written Thorah. R. Eleasar of Modein said: He who interprets Scripture in opposition to tradition (שֶׁלֹּא כַּהֲלָכָה) has no part in the world to come.[17] Among the reasons for which the tempest of war bursts upon the country, are named among others, "People who interpret Scripture in opposition to tradition" (שֶׁלֹּא כַּהֲלָכָה).[18] The traditional interpretation and the traditional law are thus declared absolutely binding. And it is consequently but consistent when deviation from these is declared even more culpable than deviation from the written Thorah. *It is more culpable to teach contrary to the precepts of the scribes, than contrary to the Thorah itself.*"[19] If the traditional interpretation is binding, it is in fact this and not the written law which decides in the last instance. Nor is anything else than this established Pharisaic principle of tradition meant by the rhetorical expression of Josephus, that the Pharisees do not allow themselves to oppose the injunctions of those who precede them in age.[20] Certainly there is infinitely more insight in these words of Josephus, than in the assertion of Geiger, that Pharisaism is "the principle of progressive development," and that Protestantism is only "the full reflection of Pharisaism."[21]

As in its position towards the law, so too in its *religious and dogmatic views* does Pharisaism simply represent the orthodox standpoint of later Judaism. In this respect the following points are brought forward, some from the New Testament, some from Josephus, as characteristic of the Pharisees in contradistinction to the Sadducees.

[17] *Aboth* iii. 11.
[18] *Aboth* v. 8.
[19] *Sanhedrin* xi. 3.
[20] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3.
[21] Geiger, *Sadducäer und Pharisäer* (separate reprint), p. 35.

1. The Pharisees teach "that every soul is imperishable, but that only those of the righteous pass into another body, while those of the wicked are, on the contrary, punished with eternal torment";[22] or, as it is said in another passage, "they hold the belief that an immortal strength belongs to souls, and that there are beneath the earth punishments and rewards for those (souls), who in life devoted themselves to virtue or vileness, and that eternal imprisonment is appointed for the latter, but the possibility of returning to life for the former."[23] The Sadducees, on the other hand, say that there is no resurrection (*μὴ εἶναι ἀνάστασιν*, Matt. xxii. 23; Mark xii. 8; Luke xx. 27; Acts xxiii. 8; comp. iv. 1, 2). "They deny the continuance of the soul and the punishments and rewards of the world below."[24] "According to their teaching, souls perish together with bodies."[25] What is here represented in a philosophizing style as the doctrine of the Pharisees, is merely the Jewish doctrine of retribution and resurrection, already testified by the Book of Daniel (Dan. xii. 2), by all subsequent Jewish literature, and also by the New Testament, as the common possession of genuine Judaism. The righteous will rise to life eternal in the glory of the Messianic kingdom, but the unrighteous will be punished with eternal torment. Nor is the essence of this faith the mere opinion of a philosophical school with respect to immortality, but that upon which depends the direct religious interest of the personal salvation of each individual. For this appears to be guaranteed only on the assumption of a resurrection of the body. Hence so great weight is laid upon this, that in the Mishna it is even said, that *he who says, that the resurrection of the dead is not to be inferred from the law, has no part in the world to come.*[26]

[22] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14. That Josephus does not intend by this to ascribe to the Pharisees the doctrine of the *transmigration of souls* is proved by the passage following.

[23] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3.

[24] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

[25] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4.

[26] *Sanhedrin* x. 1.

The Sadducees, by denying the resurrection and immortality in general, renounced at the same time the entire Messianic hope, at least in that form which later Judaism had given it. And it was they and not the Pharisees who—from the standpoint of later Judaism—represented a sectarian opinion.

2. The Pharisees also taught the existence of angels and spirits, while the Sadducees denied them (Acts xxiii. 8). This statement of the Acts, though not confirmed by other testimony, is nevertheless thoroughly trustworthy, as in entire accordance with the picture which we elsewhere obtain of the two parties. That in this respect also the Pharisees represented the general standpoint of later Judaism needs no proof.

3. Josephus ascribes also to Pharisees and Sadducees different views concerning Divine providence and human freedom. The Pharisees "make everything depend on fate and on God, and teach that the doing of good is indeed chiefly the affair of man, but that fate also co-operates in every transaction."[27] "They assert, that everything is accomplished by faith. They do not however deprive the human will of spontaneity, it having pleased God that there should be a mixture, and that to the will of fate should be added the human will with its virtue or baseness."[28] They say, that "some but not all things are the work of fate; some things depend on the will of man as to whether they are done or not."[29] The Sadducees deny fate entirely, and place God beyond the possibility of doing or providing anything evil. They say, that good and evil are at man's choice, and the doing of the one or the other at his discretion.[30] "They deny

[27] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

[28] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3. The above translation rests upon the reading τὸ θελῆσαν for τῷ θελήσαντι adopted by Bekker. [29] *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9.

[30] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14. The reading τὸν θεὸν ἔξω τοῦ ὁρᾶν τι κακὸν ἢ μὴ ὁρᾶν (for ἢ ἐφορᾶν) τίθενται, still defended by Keim, i. 281, is quite a useless conjecture, which has been again abandoned by modern editors. The word ἐφορᾶν is, as Passow's Lexicon already shows, the only technical

fate by asserting that it is nothing, and that human affairs are not brought to pass by its means. They ascribe on the contrary all to us, maintaining, that we are ourselves the cause of our prosperity, and that we also incur misfortune through our own folly." [31] At the first glance it seems very strange to meet with such philosophemes among the religious parties of Palestine, and the suspicion arises, that Josephus not only gave a philosophic colouring to religious views, according to his own fancy, but that without further ceremony he imputed philosophic theories to his countrymen; a suspicion which is increased when we also add his statements concerning the *Essenes*, whence results the systematic statement, that the Essenes taught an absolute fate, the Sadducees utterly denied fate, and the Pharisees struck out a middle path between the two. And to strengthen our suspicion still more, Josephus expressly assures us elsewhere, that the Pharisees corresponded to the Stoics, and the Essenes to the Pythagoreans.[32] In fact the very expression εἱμαρμένη, which is utterly impossible to any Jewish consciousness, proves that we have at least to deal with a strongly Hellenized colouring of Jewish views. Still it is merely the garment which is borrowed from Greece. The matter itself is genuinely Jewish. For after all, what Josephus says, when once we strip off its Greek form, is nothing more than this, that according to the Pharisees *everything* that happens takes place through God's providence, and that consequently in human actions also, whether good or bad, a co-operation of God is to be admitted. And this is a genuine Old Testament view. For, *on the one hand*, the strict comprehension of the idea of the Divine

expression in the whole Greek language for the divine supervision of the world, and indeed not only in the sense of *inspicere*, but also in that of *prospicere*, *providere*. The Hebrew עִבָּה in the saying of Akiba, quoted farther on, corresponds with it.

[31] *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9. On παρά, c. acc., meaning through, see Passow, ii. 669[b], above.

[32] *Vita*, 2, *fin.*; *Antt.* xv. 10. 4.

omnipotence leads to a conception of human actions, whether good or bad, as effected by God.[33] *On the other hand*, the Old Testament lays quite as much emphasis on the moral responsibility of man; he himself incurs guilt and punishment if he acts wrongly, as he also gains merit and reward if he acts rightly. And for later Judaism the moral independence of man was a fundamental thought, a primary assumption of its zeal for the law and its hope for the future.[34] Both lines of thought are genuinely Jewish. It is highly probable in itself, that the reflection of the learned and educated was directed towards the antinomy involved in them and sought to find a means of reconciling them. Nay, we have distinct testimony that this was the case, that Rabbinical Judaism did in fact make the problem of Divine Providence and human freedom the subject of its thought.[35] This is not however to say, that the three possible standpoints, (1) absolute fate, (2) absolute freedom, (3) interposing inspection, were each represented in so systematic a manner as Josephus states by the three parties of Essenes, Sadducees and Pharisees. This systematizing is certainly the weakest point in the representation of Josephus. Still there may be a certain amount of truth in it. It may be, that in the view of the Essenes the Divine, in that of the Sadducees the human factor occupied the foreground. In any case the Pharisees embraced with equal resolution both lines of thought: the Divine omnipotence and providence and

[33] In these words is the Old Testament view comprised in the excellent disquisition of De Visser, *De daemonologie van het Oude Testament* (Utrecht 1880), pp. 5–47. Comp. *Theol. Litztg.* 1881, col. 26.

[34] Comp. *e.g. Psalt. Salom.* ix. 7: ὁ θεός, τὰ ἔργα ἡμῶν ἐν ἐκλογῇ καὶ ἐξουσίᾳ τῆς ψυχῆς ἡμῶν, τοῦ ποιῆσαι δικαιοσύνην καὶ ἀδικίαν ἐν ἔργοις χειρῶν ἡμῶν.

[35] See especially, Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. p. 102 sqq. (art. "Bestimmung"). Also Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 111 sqq. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 381 sqq. The Apostle Paul is a proof of how much Jewish consciousness was occupied with the problem in question.

human freedom and responsibility. That the one continued to exist beside and notwithstanding the other is emphatically stated in a saying of Akiba: הַכֹּל צָפוּי וְהָרְשׁוּת נְתוּנָה, "Every thing is beheld (by God), but freedom is given (to man)."[36] Herein also the Pharisees represent not a sectarian opinion, but the correct standpoint of Judaism.

In politics too the standpoint of the Pharisees was the genuinely Jewish one of looking at political questions not from a political, but from a religious point of view. The Pharisees were by no means a "political" party, at least not directly. Their aim, viz. the strict carrying out of the law, was not political, but religious. So far as no obstruction was cast in the way of this, they could be content with any government. It was only when the secular power prevented the practice of the law in that strict manner which the Pharisees demanded, that they gathered together to oppose it, and then really became in a certain sense a political party, opposing even external resistance to external force. This took place not only at the time of the oppression by Antiochus Epiphanes, but also under the Jewish princes John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, who opposed Pharisaic ordinances from their Sadducaean standpoint. On the other hand, the Pharisees had, under Alexander, who left the whole power in their hands, a leading position in the government, which however they used only for the carrying out of their religious demands. To politics as such they were always comparatively indifferent. It must however be admitted, that there were two different *religious* points of view, especially at the time when Israel was under heathen government or under government friendly to the heathen, from which to judge of the political situation, and that according as the one or the other was placed in the foreground, an opposite demeanour would be maintained towards it. The idea of the *Divine*

[36] *Aboth* iii. 15. Derenbourg, p. 127, note, refers also to *Sifre*, § 53.

*Providence* might be made the starting-point. Thence would result the thought, that the sway of the heathen over Israel was the will of God, that it was He who had given to the Gentiles power over His people to punish them for their transgressions, that this government of the Gentiles could last only so long as it was the will of God. Hence first of all this chastisement of God must be willingly submitted to; a heathen and moreover a harsh government must be willingly borne, if only the observance of the law was not thereby prevented. From this standpoint the Pharisees Polio and Sameas, *e.g.*, exhorted their fellow-citizens to submit to the rule of Herod.[37] In the time also of the great insurrection against the Romans, we see the chief Pharisees, like Simon the son of Gamaliel, at the head of that mediatizing party, who only joined in the insurrection because they were forced to do so, while they were in heart opposed to it.[38] An entirely different result however was arrived at, when the thought of *Israel's election* was placed in the foreground. Then the rule of the heathen over the people of God would appear as an abnormity whose abolition was by all means to be striven for. Israel must acknowledge no other king than God alone, and the ruler of the house of David, whom He anointed. The supremacy of the heathen was illegal and presumptuous. From this standpoint it was questionable, not merely whether obedience and payment of tribute to a heathen power was a duty, but whether it was lawful (Matt. xxii. 17 sqq.; Mark xii. 14 sqq.; Luke xx. 22 sqq.). From this standpoint, as it seems, the majority of the Pharisees refused to take the oath to Herod.[39] It may be supposed that this was the specially popular standpoint, both with the people and the Pharisees. Indeed it must have been such, since every non-Pharisaic government, even when it did not prevent the practice of the

[37] *Antt.* xiv. 9. 4, xv. 1. 1.
[38] Com. on Simon, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 3. 9.
[39] *Antt.* xv. 10. 4, xvii. 24.

law, involved a certain compromise of its free exercise. Hence it was a Pharisee, one Saddukos, who in conjunction with Judas of Galilee founded the revolutionary party of the *Zealots*.[40] Indifferent then as Pharisaism at first was to politics, the revolutionary current, which in the time of Christ was continually increasing among the Jewish people, must be set to the account of its influence.

The characteristics of Pharisaism hitherto described show no peculiarity by which it may be distinguished from post-exilian Judaism in general. So far as it is only regarded as an intellectual tendency, it is simply identical with that adopted by the Judaism of the post-exilian period, at least in its main branches and classic representatives. Still it formed a *party within the nation*, an *ecclesiola in ecclesia*. In one of the two passages in which Josephus, or rather his authority Nikolaus Damascenus, speaks of the refusal of the oath by the Pharisees, he designates them as a *μόριόν τι Ἰουδαικῶν ἀνθρώπων*, and states their number as six thousand.[41] This leads us to infer a definite boundary of their circle. In the New Testament also and in Josephus the Pharisees evidently appear as a decided fraction of the people. In the same sense also must their *name* be explained. It is in Hebrew פְּרוּשִׁים,[42] in Aramaic פְּרִישַׁיָּא, *stat. emphat.* פְּרִישַׁיָּא, whence the Greek *Φαρισαῖοι*. That this literally means "the separated" is undoubted. The only question can be, to what to refer the term. Are they those who separate themselves from *all uncleanness* and all illegality, or those who separate themselves from certain *persons?* The first is spoken for by the circumstance, that in Rabbinic Hebrew also the substantives פְּרִישָׁה and פְּרִישׁוּת occur with the meaning "separation," *scil.* from all uncleanness.[42a] But if only a separation from unclean-

[40] *Antt.* xviii. 41; comp. i. 6.

[41] *Antt.* xvii. 2. 4.

[42] *Jadajim* iv. 6–8; *Chagiga* ii. 7; *Sota* iii. 4.

[42a] *Sabim* v. 1: לאחר פְּרִישָׁתוֹ מימטמאין, "After he was separated from

ness, without any reference to persons, were intended, other positive epithets would have been more obvious (the "clean," the "just," the "pious," or the like). Besides, a separation from uncleanness is at the same time a separation from unclean persons. If then the latter is in any case to be included, it seems obvious to derive the name from that "separation," which took place in the time of Zerubbabel and then again in the time of Ezra, when Israel separated from the heathen dwelling in the land and from their uncleanness (Ezra vi. 21, ix. 1, x. 11; Neh. ix. 2, x. 29). Wellhausen however is in the right when he objects to this, that this separation, to which all Israel then submitted, had about it nothing characteristic of the Pharisees.[43] For the Pharisees must have their name from a separation, which the bulk of the nation did *not* undergo with them; in other words, from a *separation made by them, in consequence of their stricter view of the notion of uncleanness, not only from the uncleanness of the heathen, but also from that with which, according to their view, a great portion of the people were affected.* It was in this sense that they were called the separated or the separating, and they might have been so called from either praise or blame. They might so have called themselves, because they kept as far as possible from all uncleanness, and therefore also from contact with unclean persons. Or they might have been so named in a reproachful sense by their adversaries, as "the separatists," who for the sake of their own special cleanness separated themselves from the bulk of the nation.[44] The latter

what defiled him." *Tohoroth* iv. 12: טהרת פְּרִישׁוּת, "The cleanness of the separated life." *Sota* ix. 15: "Since Rabban Gamaliel the elder died, there has been no more טָהֳרָה וּפְרִישׁוּת. *Aboth* iii. 13: "R. Akiba said: Vows are a fence for the פְּרִישׁוּת" (*i.e.* they serve for its maintenance and preservation).

[43] Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 76 sqq.

[44] This view, though intermingled with other points of view, is also the prevailing one in the explanations of the Fathers and the Rabbis. See Clem.,

was certainly the original meaning of the name. For it is not probable that they gave it to themselves. Other positive self-designations would have been more obvious to them, and in fact they first appear in history under the name of חֲסִידִים (see below). Their adversaries however called them "the separatists." This also explains why the name so seldom occurs in our oldest Rabbinical authority the Mishna; in the chief passage in the mouth of an adversary and only twice

*Homil.* xi. 28: *οἵ εἰσιν ἀφωρισμένοι καὶ τὰ νόμιμα ὡς γραμματεῖς τῶν ἄλλων πλεῖον εἰδότες.* Pseudo-Tertullian, *adv. haer.* c. 1: Pharisaeos, qui additamenta quaedam legis adstruendo a *Judaeis divisi sunt*, unde etiam hoc accipere ipsum quod habent nomen digni fuerunt. Origenes, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 2 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, iv. 194): Qui autem majus aliquid profitentes *dividunt se ipsos quasi meliores a multis*, secundum hoc Pharisaei dicuntur, qui interpretantur divisi et segregati. Phares enim divisio appellatur. Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 23 sqq. (Lommatzsch, iv. 219 sq.): Similiter Pharisaei sunt omnes qui justificant semetipsos, et *dividunt se a caeteris dicentes: noli mihi appropriare, quoniam mundus sum.* Interpretantur autem Pharisaei, secundum nomen Phares, divisi, qui se ipsos a caeteris diviserunt. Phares, autem dicitur hebraica lingua divisio. Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxiii. 29 (Lommatzsch, iv. 233): Recte Pharisaei sunt appellati, id est praecisi, qui spiritualia prophetarum a corporali historia praeciderunt. Idem, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. vi. c. 13 (Lommatzsch, i. 210): *Οἱ δὲ Φαρισαῖοι, ἅτε κατὰ τὸ ὄνομα ὄντες διηρημένοι τινὲς καὶ στασιώδεις.* Idem, *Comment. in Joann.* vol. xiii. c. 54, *fin.* (Lommatzsch, ii. 113): *Φαρισαίων δὲ τῶν ἀποδιηρημένων καὶ τὴν θείαν ἑνότητα ἀπολωλεκότων· Φαρισαῖοι γὰρ ἑρμηνεύονται· οἱ διηρημένοι.* Epiphanius, *haer.* 16, 1: *Ἐλέγοντο δὲ Φαρισαῖοι διὰ τὸ ἀφωρισμένους εἶναι αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν ἄλλων, διὰ τὴν ἐθελοπερισσοθρησκείαν τὴν παρ' αὐτοῖς νενομισμένην. Φάρες γὰρ κατὰ τὴν Ἑβραΐδα ἑρμηνεύεται ἀφορισμός.* Hieronymus, *contra Luciferianos*, c. 23 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 197): Pharisaei a *Judaeis divisi* propter quasdam observationes superfluas nomen quoque a dissidio susceperunt (according to Pseudo-Tertullian, comp. below, note 89). Idem, *Comment. in Matt.* xxii. 23 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 177): Pharisaei traditionum et observationum, quas illi *δευτερώσεις* vocant, justitiam praeferebant, unde et *divisi* vocabantur a *populo;* Sadducaei autem, qui interpretantur justi, et ipsi vendicabant sibi quod non erant. Nathan ben Jehiel declares in the *Aruch:* פרוש הוא שפירש עצמו מכל טומאה ומן מאכל טמא ועם הארץ שאינו מדקדק במאכל, "A Parush is one who separates himself from all uncleanness, and from unclean food, and from the people of the land, who are not careful what they eat." For further testimony, see Buxtorf, *Lex Chald.* col. 1851 sq.; Drusius, *De tribis sectis Judaeorum*, lib. ii. c. 2; De Wette, *Archäologie*, p. 413.

besides.[45] The last-named fact certainly shows that the Pharisees on their part accepted the party name when once naturalized. And they might well do so, for from their standpoint the "separation" from which they obtained the name was one thoroughly praiseworthy and well-pleasing to God.

If the name Perushim shows that the Pharisees appeared as "separatists" in the eyes of their adversaries, another name shows us their own view of their character and community. They called themselves merely *Chaberim* (חֲבֵרִים), "neighbours," this term being, in the language of the Mishna and of ancient Rabbinical literature in general, exactly identical with that of Perushim. It is self-evident from the matter of the passages given above (vol. ii. p. 8), that a Chaber in them everywhere means one *who strictly observes the law, especially the laws relating to cleanness and uncleanness.* And indeed the term comprises all those who do so, and therefore not merely those who are scholars by profession. For it is not the unlearned,[46] but as the tenor of the passages shows, the bulk of those in whom no strict observance of the law can be assumed, the "people of the land" (עַם הָאָרֶץ),[47] who form the

[45] The chief passage is *Jadajim* iv. 6–8; the two other passages, *Chagiga* ii. 7; *Sota* iii. 4.

[46] The unlearned is called, in contrast to the learned, הָדְיוֹט, ἰδιώτης, *Rosh hashana* ii. 8. The notion of the Chaber includes both the הָדְיוֹט and the חָכָם. See Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, p. 122 sq.

[47] Am-haarez is the people who dwell in the land, but do not belong to the community of Israel. The expression however is not used as a collective term only, but also to designate an individual, *e.g.* an Am-haarez (*i.e.* one of the people of the land). See in general, *Demai* i. 2, 3, ii. 2, 3, iii. 4, vi. 9, 12; *Shebiith* v. 9; *Maaser sheni* iii. 3, iv. 6; *Chagiga* ii. 7; *Gittin* v. 9; *Edujoth* i. 14; *Aboth* ii. 5, iii. 10; *Horajoth* iii. 8; *Kinnim* iii. 6; *Toharoth* iv. 5, vii. 1, 2, 4, 5, viii. 1, 2, 3, 5; *Machshirin* vi. 3; *Tebul jom.* iv. 5. Weber, *System*, pp. 42–44. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, p. 527 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 54–56 (article "Am-haarez"). The older literature in Jo. Christph. Wolf, *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.* on John vii. 49. See the expositors in general on John vii. 49 (Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetzstein, Lampe, and others).

contrast. Hence the usage of language of the Middle Ages, according to which a Chaber is a "colleague" of the Rabbis, a scholar, must not be imported into these passages of the Mishna.[48] On the contrary, Chaber is in the latter any one who strictly observes the law, including the *παραδόσεις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων*, and is thus identical with Pharisee.[49] This

[48] In this sense *e.g.* it is explained by Maimonides on *Demai* ii. 3: חבר נקרא תלמיד חכם וכן יקראו לתלמידי חכמים חברים. Elias Levita in the *Tishbi*, *s.v.*, explains חבר by חבר הרב, "colleague of the Rabbi," *i.e.* one who has indeed received the ordination of scholars, but is not yet a public teacher (see the passage *e.g.* in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxi. 907; Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 142). The majority of Christian scholars follow Elias Levita; see the list of them in Ursinus, *Antiquitates Hebraicae*, c. 8 (Ugolini, *Thes.* xxi. 907), and in Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 143. I bring forward only the following: Scaliger (*Elenchus trihaeresii Scrarii*, c. 10), Buxtorf (*Lex. Chald. s.v.*), Otho (*Lex. Rabbin. s.v.*), Wagenseil (*Sota*, p. 1026 sq.), Vitringa (*De synagoga vetere*, lib. ii. c. 10, p. 571). This explanation however is in opposition to the Mishna and the older Rabbinical literature. Of course חבר may here too denote the colleagues (companions) of a scholar or a judge (*e.g. Edujoth* v. 7; *Sanhedrin* xi. 2). But where it is merely used as a *terminus technicus*, without statement of any special reference, it differs from חכם and תלמיד חכם, and denotes a wider circle than these. Comp. *e.g. Kiddushin* 33b (in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* חבר): אתון חכימי ואנא חבר, "You are scholars, and I am only a Chaber." *Shabbath* 11a: תחת גוי ולא תחת חבר תחת חבר ולא תחת תלמיד חכם, "Under a Gentile and not under a Chaber, under a Chaber and not under the pupil of a scholar" (the passage is already quoted in the *Aruch*, *s.v.* חבר, in explanation of this term; on its meaning, see Weber, *System*, p. 142). *Bechoroth* 30b: הבא לקבל דברי חבירות צריך לקבל בפני נ' חברים ואפילו תלמיד חכם צריך לקבל בפני שלש חברים, "He who will take upon himself the decrees of the association (*chaberuth*) must do so in the presence of three chaberim; even if he is the pupil of a scholar, he must do it in the presence of three chaberim."

[49] The identity of *parush* and *chaber* results chiefly from a comparison of *Chagiga* ii. 7 with *Demai* ii. 3 (see the passages above, vol. i. pp. 385, 386). In the first passage Am-haarez and Parush, in the latter Am-haarez and Chaber are contrasted, and that in such wise, that in both passages the Am-haarez is the unclean, by whose garments the Parush and Chaber are respectively defiled. Evidently then the two latter are identical. Rightly therefore does Nathan ben Jehiel give to פרושים in the *Aruch* (*s.v.* פרוש, and indeed with a citation of the passage *Chagiga* ii. 7) the explanation: הן החברין האוכלין חוליהן בטהרה, "They are the Chaberim who eat their profane food in cleanness." Comp. especially the excellent discussion of Guisius on *Demai* ii. 3 (in

gives us however a deeper insight of the self-estimation of Pharisaism. It so far stands on a level with the general Judaism of the post-exilian period, that to it also the population of Palestine is divided into two categories: (1) *The congregation of Israel, i.e.* the Chaberim, for חָבֵר means simply "neighbour," fellow-countryman,[50] and (2) the people dwelling in the land. In the eyes of Pharisaism however the former term is restricted to the circle of those, who strictly observe the law together with the entire *παραδόσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων.* All besides are Am-haarez, and therefore do not belong to the true congregation of Israel. Consequently Pharisaism estimates itself as very specially the *ecclesiola in ecclesia.* Only the circle of the Pharisaic association represents the true Israel, who perfectly observe the law and have therefore a claim to the promises.[51]

And their demeanour practically agreed with this theoretical estimation. As an Israelite avoided as far as possible all contact with a heathen, lest he should thereby be defiled, so did the Pharisee avoid as far as possible contact with the non-Pharisee, because the latter was to him included in the notion of the unclean Am-haarez. "The garments of the

Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 83). Edzardus, *Tractatus Talmudici Avoda Sara caput secundum* (Hamburg 1710), pp. 531-534. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on Matt. iii. 7 (*Opp.* ii. 271b). Jost, *Gesch. des Judenth.* i. 204. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, pp. 42–46, 77. Meanings corresponding to the correct one are found in Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.* חבֵרא. The same, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* חבר. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 126–129 (article "Chaber").

[50] חבר may of course have in itself very different meanings. The above however is the only possible one in accordance with the usage of Old Testament language, when it is used in contrast to עם הארץ. חבר is undoubtedly used in this sense in *Chullin* xi. 2, where it stands in contrast with נָכְרִי (a foreigner); also in the passage quoted above (note 48) from *Shabbath* 11a, where it stands midway between גוי and תלמיד חכם.

[51] The question "who is my neighbour?" (Luke x. 29) was therefore quite seriously intended. To Jewish consciousness it was in fact an important question, who was to be acknowledged as a Chaber.

Am-haarez are unclean for the Perushim."[52] "A Chaber does not go as a guest to an Am-haarez nor receive him as a guest within his walls."[53] "If the wife of a Chaber has left the wife of an Am-haarez grinding in her house, the house is unclean if the mill stops; if it goes on grinding, only unclean so far as she can reach by stretching out her hand," etc.[54] When then the Gospels relate, that the Pharisees found fault with the free intercourse of Jesus with "publicans and sinners," and with His entering into their houses (Mark ii. 14–17; Matt. ix. 9–13; Luke v. 27–32), this agrees exactly with the standpoint here described. The Pharisees did in fact "separate" from the people of the land, so far as to avoid close intercourse with them. Hence the name *Perushim* was rightly given them; nay, from their own standpoint they had no reason for rejecting it.

This exclusiveness of Pharisaism certainly justifies the calling it an αἵρεσις, a sect, as is done both in the New Test. (Acts xv. 5, xxvi. 5) and by Josephus. Nevertheless it remains the fact, that it was the legitimate and classic representative of post-exilian Judaism in general. It did but carry out with relentless energy the consequences of its principle. Those only are the true Israel who observe the law in the strictest manner. Since only the Pharisees did this in the full sense, they only were the true Israel, which was related to the remaining bulk of the people as these were to the heathen.

Not till after these general characteristics of Pharisaism had been discussed could the question concerning its *origin* arise and its *history* be briefly sketched. Viewed according to its essence, it is as old as legal Judaism in general. When once the accurate observance of the ceremonial law is regarded as the true essence of religious conduct, Pharisaism already exists

[52] *Chagiga* ii. 7. [53] *Demai* ii. 3.
[54] *Tohoroth* vii. 4. Compare the passages quoted in note 47.

in principle. It is another question however when it first appeared *as a sect, as a fraction within the Jewish nation.* And in this sense it cannot be traced farther back than to the time of the Maccabaean conflicts. In these the "pious" (*οἱ Ἀσιδαῖοι, i.e.* חֲסִידִים), who plainly formed a special fraction within the people, also took part (1 Macc. ii. 42, vii. 12 sqq.). They fought indeed on the side of Judas for the religion of their fathers, but they were not identical with the Maccabaean party.[55] They evidently represented, as may be inferred from their name, that strictest party which upheld with special zeal the observance of the law. *Hence they are the same party, whom we again meet with some decades later under the name of Pharisees.* It appears that during the Greek period, when the chief priests and rulers of the people took up an increasingly lax attitude towards the law, they united themselves more closely into an association of such as made a duty of its most punctilious observance. When then the Maccabees raised the standard to fight for the faith of their fathers, these "pious" took part in the conflict, but only as long as the faith and the law were actually contended for. When this was no longer the case, and the object of the contest became more and more the national independence, they seem to have retired. Hence we no longer hear of them under Jonathan and Simon. Not till John Hyrcanus do they again appear, and then under the name of "Pharisees," no longer indeed on the side of the Maccabees, but in hostile opposition to them. The course of affairs had brought it to pass, that the priestly family of the Maccabees should found a political dynasty. The ancient high-priestly family had been supplanted. The Maccabees or Asmonaeans had entered into its political inheritance. But with this, tasks which were essentially political had devolved upon them. The chief

[55] This has been well pointed out especially by Wellhausen (pp. 78–86), who rightly identifies the Chasidim with the Pharisees.

matter in their eyes was no longer the carrying out of the law, but the maintenance and extension of their political power. The prosecution however of these political objects could not but more and more separate them from their old friends the "Chasidim" or "Perushim." Not that they had apostatized from the law. But a secular policy was in itself scarcely reconcilable with that legal scrupulosity and carefulness which the Pharisees required. It was inevitable, that sooner or later there should be a breach between them and their two opposite pursuits. This breach occurred under John Hyrcanus. At the beginning of his government, he still adhered to the Pharisees, but afterwards renounced them and turned to the Sadducees. The occasion of the breach is related by Josephus in a legendary style.[56] But the fact itself, that this change took place under Hyrcanus, is thoroughly authentic. And in consequence we henceforth find the Pharisees the opponents of the Asmonaean priest-princes. They were such not only under John Hyrcanus, but also under Aristobulus I., and especially Alexander Jannaeus. Under the latter, who as a fierce warrior entirely disregarded the interest of religion, it came even to open revolution. For six years Alexander Jannaeus with his mercenary troops was in conflict against the people led by the Pharisees.[57] And what he at last attained was only the external intimidation, not the real subdual of his opponents. The stress laid upon religious interests by the Pharisees had won the bulk of the nation to their side. Hence it is no cause for surprise, that Alexandra for the sake of being at peace with her people abandoned the power to the Pharisees. Their victory was now complete, the whole conduct of internal affairs was in their hands. All the decrees of the Pharisees done away with by Hyrcanus were reintroduced, and they completely ruled the public life of the

[56] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 5–6. [57] *Antt.* xiii. 13. 5.

nation.[58] And this continued in all essentials even during subsequent ages. Amidst all the changes of government, under Romans and Herodians, the Pharisees maintained their spiritual hegemony. Consistency with principle was on their side. And this consistency procured them the spiritual supremacy. It is true that the Sadducaean high priests were at the head of the Sanhedrin. But in fact the decisive influence upon public affairs was in the hands, not of the Sadducees, but of the Pharisees. They had the bulk of the nation as their ally,[59] the women especially were in their hands.[60] *They had the greatest influence upon the congregations, so that all acts of public worship, prayers and sacrifices were performed according to their injunctions.*[61] Their sway over the masses was so absolute, that they could obtain a hearing, even when they said anything against the king or the high priest,[62] consequently they were the most capable of counteracting the designs of the kings.[63] *Hence too the Sadducees in their official acts adhered to the demands of the Pharisees, because otherwise the multitude would not have tolerated them.*[64] This great influence actually exercised by the Pharisees is but the reverse side of the exclusive position which they took up. It was just because their requirements stretched so far, and because they only recognised as true Israelites those who observed them in their full strictness, that they had so imposing an effect upon the multitude, who recognised in these exemplary saints their own ideal and their legitimate leaders.

[58] *Antt.* xiii. 16. 2.
[59] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6: τὸ πλῆθος σύμμαχον ἐχόντων.
[60] *Antt.* xvii. 2. 4: οἷς ὑπῆκτο ἡ γυναικωνῖτις.
[61] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3: τοῖς δήμοις πιθανώτατοι τυγχάνουσι κ.τ.λ.
[62] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 5. [63] *Antt.* xvii. 2. 4. [64] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4.

## II. THE SADDUCEES.

The nature of the Sadducees is not as evident as that of the Pharisees. The scanty statements furnished by documents can only with difficulty be brought under a single point of sight. And the reason of this seems to lie in the nature of the case. The Sadducees are no simple and consistent phenomenon like the Pharisees, but so to speak a compound one, which must be apprehended from different points.

The most salient characteristic is that they are *aristocrats*. Josephus repeatedly designates them as such. "They only gain the well-to-do, they have not the people on their side."[65] "This doctrine has reached *few individuals*, but these are of *the first consideration*."[66] When Josephus here says, that this doctrine has reached but few, this is quite consistent with his manner of always depicting Pharisaism and Sadduceeism as philosophical tendencies. Taking off this varnish, his actual statement is, that the Sadducees were the aristocrats, the wealthy (*εὔποροι*), the persons of rank (*πρῶτοι τοῖς ἀξιώμασιν*). And that is to say, that they chiefly belonged to the priesthood. For from the commencement of the Greek, nay from the Persian period, it was the priests who governed the Jewish State, as it was also the priesthood in general that constituted the nobility of the Jewish people.[67] The New Testament testifies superabundantly and Josephus expressly, that the high-priestly families belonged to the Sadducean party.[68] Rightly however as this view is for the first time expressly advocated by Geiger, it must not be so

[65] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6: *τοὺς εὐπόρους μόνον πειθόντων, τὸ δὲ δημοτικὸν οὐχ ἑπόμενον αὐτοῖς ἐχόντων.*

[66] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4: *εἰς ὀλίγους ἄνδρας οὗτος ὁ λόγος ἀφίκετο, τοὺς μέντοι πρώτους τοῖς ἀξιώμασι.*

[67] Joseph. *Vita*, 1.

[68] Acts v. 17; *Antt.* xx. 9. 1.

understood as to make the Sadducees nothing more than the party of the priests. The contrast of Sadducees and Pharisees is not a contrast of the priestly and the strictly legal party, but of aristocratic priests and strictly legal persons. The Pharisees were by no means in hostile opposition to the priests as such. On the contrary, they interpreted the legal enactments concerning the revenues of the priesthood abundantly in their favour, awarding to them in full measure, pressed down, shaken together and running over, their heave-offerings, tithes, first-born, etc.,[69] and decidedly acknowledging the greater sanctity and higher rank of the priests in the Theocracy.[70] On the other hand too, the priests were not all thoroughly hostile to Pharisaism. There were, at least in the last decades before, and the first decades after the destruction of the temple, a large number of priests who themselves belonged to the Rabbinical class.[71] Hence the opponents of the Pharisees were not the priests as such, but only the *aristocratic* priests: those who by their possessions and offices also occupied influential civil positions.

In view of these facts it is an interesting conjecture of Geiger's—which he indeed expresses as a certainty—that

[69] Comp. in the Mishna the treatises *Demai*, *Terumoth*, *Maaseroth*, *Challa*, *Bikkurim*, *Bechoroth*.

[70] *Chagiga* ii. 7: The garments of the Perushim are held as Midras (unclean) for those who eat of the heave-offerings (*i.e.* the priests). *Horajoth* iii. 8: כהן קודם ללוי, לוי לישראל. Precedence was also given to the priests in the reading of the Scriptures in the synagogues.

[71] It was already testified (*Chagiga* ii. 7) of Joses ben Joeser, that he was a חסיד in the priesthood. One Joeser, who was captain of the temple and therefore a priest, belonged to the school of Shammai (*Orla* ii. 12). In Josephus we meet with a Ἰώζαρος ἱερατικοῦ γένους, Φαρισαῖος καὶ αὐτός (Joseph. *Vita*, 39). Josephus was himself both priest and Pharisee (*Vita*, i. 2). There is mention moreover (*Edujoth* viii. 2) of a Rabbi Judah ha-Kohen and (*Edujoth* viii. 2; *Aboth* ii. 8) a Rabbi Joses ha-Kohen. Rabbi Chananiah סְגַן הַכֹּהֲנִים (see vol. i. p. 368) and Rabbi Eleasar ben Asariah (see vol. i. p. 372 sq.) are renowned among priestly scribes. Rabbi Ishmael and Rabbi Tarphon are said to have been priests (see vol. i. pp. 373 and 376).

the Sadducees derive their name צְדוּקִים,[72] *Σαδδουκαῖοι*,[73] from that Zaddok the priest, whose family had exercised the priestly office at Jerusalem since the time of Solomon. At all events it may now be considered as settled, that the name must not, as was formerly often thought, be derived from the adjective צַדִּיק,[74] but from the proper name צָדוֹק.[75] For in the first derivation the change from *i* to *u* is inexplicable,[76] while on the other hand the pronunciation Zadduk (*Σαδδούκ*, צַדּוּק) is undoubtedly guaranteed by the concurrent testimony of the Septuagint,[77] of Josephus,[78] and of a vowel-pointed MS. of the

[72] So are they called in the Mishna, *Jadajim* iv. 6–7; *Erubin* vi. 2; *Makkoth* i. 6; *Para* iii. 7; *Nidda* iv. 2. The singular is in *Erubin* vi. 2. צדוקי, which in the *Cod. de Rossi* is pointed צָדּוּקִי (Kametz and Pathach being often interchanged in this manuscript; in the other passages the name is not vowelized).

[73] So in Josephus and the New Testament.

[74] So already in many of the Fathers, *e.g.* Epiphanius, *haer.* 14: *ἐπονομάζουσι δὲ οὗτοι ἑαυτοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, δηθὲν ἀπὸ δικαιοσύνης τῆς ἐπικλήσεως ὁρμωμένης. Σεδὲκ γὰρ ἑρμηνεύεται δικαιοσύνη.* Hieronymus, *Comm. in Matt.* xxii. 23 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 177): Sadducaei autem, qui interpretantur justi. In recent times the derivation from צַדִּיק has been again advocated by Derenbourg (*Histoire*, p. 78) and Hamburger (*Enc.* p. 1041).

[75] That this is the only possible derivation has been most carefully shown by Montet (*Essai sur les origines des partis saducéen et pharisien*, pp. 45–60). Comp. also besides Geiger, Hitzig, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, p. 469. Keim, i. 274 sq. Hanne, *Zeitschr. f. wiss. Theol.* 1867, p. 167. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* i. 118; *Bibellex.* iv. 520. Wellhausen, p. 45 sqq. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 342 sq.; *Theol. Tijdschr.* 1875, p. 639. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1876, p. 136. Oort, *De naam Sudducëen* (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1876, pp. 605–617). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schrift A. T.'s*, § 396. Sieffert in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xiii. 230.

[76] Wieseler indeed feigns an adjective zadduk, for the existence of which however the proof is still due.

[77] The name Zadok occurs in the O. T., according to the statement of Brecher's *Concordance* (1876), in all 53 times. Among these in ten passages in Ezekiel, Ezra and Nehemiah (Ezek. xl. 46, xliii. 19, xliv. 15, xlviii. 11; Ezra vii. 2; Neh. iii. 4, iii. 29, x. 21, xi. 11, xiii. 13), the LXX. has the form *Σαδδούκ*, *i.e.* according to the correct text, which certainly has in some passages to be restored by the revision according to the MSS. of the printed text.

[78] A Pharisee *Σάδδουκος* is mentioned *Antt.* xviii. 1. 1. Comp. also

Mishna[79] for the proper name Zadok. The party name צדוקים is thus related to צדוק as בויתסים to Boethos or אפיקורוסים to Epicuros. The further question, from *what* Zadok the Sadducees derive their name is of less certain decision. An apocryphal legend in the *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan* traces it to a supposed disciple of Antigonus von Socho named Zadok.[80] But the legend is useless notwithstanding the vigorous defence of it by Baneth,[81] (1) because the Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan cannot, on account of their late origin, be at all regarded as historical authority for our period, (2) because especially what

Ἀνανίας Σαδδουκί, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 17. 10, 21. 7, where Σαδδουκί cannot mean "Sadducee," the person in question being, according to *Vita*, 39, a Pharisee.

[79] In the *Cod. de Rossi* 138 the name of Rabbi Zadok is indeed only vowelized in a minority of passages; still where this is the case it is almost always צָדוֹק (or צָדוֹק, Pathach and Kametz being often interchanged), viz. in the following passages, *Pea* ii. 4; *Terumoth* x. 9; *Shabbath* xxiv. 5; *Pesachim* iii. 6, vii. 2, x. 3.

[80] *Aboth de-Rabbi Nathan*, c. 5: "Antigonus of Socho received the tradition from Simon the Just. He said: Be not like servants, who serve their Lord for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without regard to recompense, and be always in the fear of God, that your reward may be double in the future. Antigonus of Socho had two disciples, who taught his saying. They delivered it to their pupils, who in their turn delivered it to theirs. Then they stood up and tampered with its meaning and said: What then did our fathers think, when they spoke thus? Is it possible that a workman should work all day and not receive his wages in the evening? If our fathers had known, that there is a future life and a resurrection of the dead, they would not so have spoken. Then they stood up and renounced the Thorah, and a twofold schism proceeding from them branched off: Sadducees and Boethosees, the Sadducees after the name of Zadok, the Boethosees after the name of Boethos." See the passage also in Tailer, *Tractatus de patribus* (London 1654), p. 33. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 105. Herzfeld, iii. 382. Wellhausen, p. 46. Taylor, *Sayings of the Jewish Fathers* (1877), p. 126. Baneth, *Magazin für die Wissenschaft des Judenthums*, ninth year, 1882, p. 4 (here is found the translation given above). The Boethosees (בויתסים), who are also once mentioned in the Mishna (*Menachoth* x. 3), derived their name from the high-priestly family Boethos in the time of Herod (see vol. i. p. 204). Hence they are in any case related to the Sadducees.

[81] Baneth, *Magazin f. die Wissensch. des Judenth.* ix. 1882, pp. 1–37, 61–95.

is said of the Boethosees is certainly erroneous (see note 80), and (3) because the legend contains no tradition, but only a learned combination: the Sadducees, who denied the immortality of the soul, being said to have embraced this heresy through a misunderstanding of the saying of Antigonus of Socho, that we ought to do good without regard to future reward.[82] Thus there is left us only the choice of deriving the name of the Sadducees from one Zadok, unknown to us, who in some time equally unknown founded the party of the aristocrats, or of referring it to the priestly race of the Zadokites. The former is possible, and is preferred *e.g.* by Kuenen and Montet,[83] but the latter is certainly the more probable.[84] The posterity of Zadok performed priestly service in the temple from the time of Solomon. After the Deuteronomic reformation, which interdicted all sacrifice out of Jerusalem, the rites there carried on were alone esteemed legitimate. Hence Ezekiel in his ideal picture of the theocracy awards to the "Zadokites" (בְּנֵי צָדוֹק) alone the right of officiating as priests in the temple at Jerusalem (Ezek. xl. 46, xliii. 19, xliv. 15, xlviii. 11). Ezekiel's demand did not indeed entirely prevail on the restoration of worship after the captivity, since some of the other priestly races were also able to maintain their rights.[85] Still the Zadokites formed the pith and chief element of the priesthood in the post-exilian period. This is seen especially from the circumstance, that the Chronicler in his genealogy traces back the house of Zadok to Eleasar, the elder son of Aaron, thus giving us to

[82] Comp. Wellhausen, p. 46. The saying of Antigonus of Socho, on which the combination depends, is found *Aboth* i. 3. See vol. i. p. 352.

[83] Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 342 sq.; *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, p. 639. Montet, *Essai*, p. 59.

[84] So think all named in note 75, except Kuenen and Montet.

[85] This is to be inferred from the fact, that in 1 Chron. x. besides the line of Eleasar (*i.e.* the Zadokites), the line of Ithamar also appears as authorized to fill the priestly service.

understand, that the Zadokites had, if not the only, still the first and nearest claim to the priesthood (1 Chron. v. 30–41). This procedure of the Chronicler at the same time proves, that the name of the ancestor of this race was still vividly remembered in his times, and therefore in the Greek period also. Consequently *a party which attached itself to the aristocratic priests might very well be named the Zadokitian or Sadducaean.* For though the aristocratic priests were but a fraction of the בְּנֵי צָדוֹק, they were still its authoritative representatives and their tendency the Zadokian.[86]

This distinctive mark of the Sadducees, viz. their aristocratic character, being now settled, the further mark must next be added, that they *acknowledged only the written Thorah as binding, and on the other hand rejected the entire traditionary interpretation and further development of the law during the course of centuries by the scribes.* "The Sadducees say, only what is written is to be esteemed as legal. On the contrary, what has come down from the tradition of the fathers need not be observed."[87] So far removed were they from the principle of absolute authority as held by the Pharisees, that they thought it, on the contrary, commendable to oppose their teachers.[88] It is evident, that what was in question was simply a rejection of the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, and therefore of the entire mass of legal decisions which had been made by the Pharisaic scribes for the completion and application of the written law. The opinion of many Fathers, that the Sadducees acknowledged only the Pentateuch, but rejected the prophets,[89]

[86] Comp. especially, Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 47–50. Idem, *Gesch. Israels*, i. 127–130, 230 sq. Also Kuenen, *Zadok en de Zadokieten* (*Theol. Tijdschr.* 1869, pp. 463–509).

[87] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6. Comp. xviii. 1. 4. [88] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4.

[89] Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, i. 49 (*Opp.* ed. Lommatzsch, xviii. 93): οἱ μόνου δὲ Μωσέως παραδεχόμενοι τὰς βίβλους Σαμαρεῖς ἢ Σαδδουκαῖοι. Idem, *Comment. in Matth.* vol. xvii. c. 35 (on Matt. xxii. 29, in Lommatzsch, iv. 166): τοῖς Σαδδουκαίοις μὴ προσιεμένοις ἄλλην γραφὴν ἢ τὴν νομικήν . . . τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους, ὅτι μὴ προσιέμενοι τὰς ἐξῆς τῷ νόμῳ γραφὰς πλανῶνται.

is not confirmed by documentary authority, and has therefore been given up as erroneous by modern scholars.[90] Beside these main principles, on which the Sadducees opposed the entire Pharisaic tradition, specific legal differences between Sadducees and Pharisees have but a minor interest. A number of differences of this kind are mentioned in Rabbinical literature.[91] Some of these notices cannot however be esteemed as historical tradition, especially the statements of the very late commentary on *Megilloth Taanith*. So far as they are trustworthy, they are so isolated and unconnected that no unifying principle can be perceived in them, and certainly not that discovered by Geiger, viz. an advocacy of priestly interests by the Sadducees.[92] In *penal legislation* the Sadducees were,

*Ibid.* vol. xvii. c. 36 (on Matt. xxii. 31, 32, in Lommatzsch, iv. 169): καὶ εἰς τοῦτο δὲ φήσομεν, ὅτι μύρια δυνάμενος περὶ τοῦ ὑπάρχειν τὴν μέλλουσαν ζωὴν τοῖς ἀνθρώποις παραθέσθαι ἀπὸ προφητῶν ὁ Σωτὴρ, τοῦτο οὐ πεποίηκεν διὰ τὸ τοὺς Σαδδουκαίους μόνην προσίεσθαι τὴν Μωσέως γραφὴν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐβουλήθη αὐτοὺς συλλογισμῷ δυσωπῆσαι. Hieronymus, *Comment. in Matth.* xxii. 31, 32 (Vallarsi, vii. 1. 179): Hi quinque tantum libros Moysis recipiebant, prophetarum vaticinia respuentes. Stultum ergo erat inde proferre testimonia, cujus auctoritatem non sequebantur. *Philosophumena*, ix. 29: προφήταις δὲ οὐ προσέχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐδὲ ἑτέροις τισὶ σοφοῖς, πλὴν μόνῳ τῷ διὰ Μωσέως νόμῳ, μηδὲν ἑρμηνεύοντες. Pseudo-Tertullian, *adv. haer.* c. 1: Taceo enim Judaismi haereticos, Dositheum inquam Samaritanum, qui primus ausus est prophetas quasi non in spiritu sancto locutos repudiare, taceo Sadducaeos, qui ex hujus erroris radice surgentes ausi sunt ad hanc haeresim etiam resurrectionem carnis negare. With this corresponds almost verbally Hieronymus, *contra Luciferanos*, c. 23 (Vallarsi, ii. 197): Taceo de Judaismi haereticis, qui ante adventum Christi legem traditam dissiparunt: quod Dosithaeus Samaritanorum princeps prophetas repudiavit: quod Sadducaei ex illius radice nascentes etiam resurrectionem carnis negaverunt.

[90] It is still defended *e.g.* by Serarius, *Trihaeresium*, lib. ii. c. 21. Against him, see Scaliger, *Elenchus trihaeresii Serarii*, c. 16; Drusius, *De tribus sectis Judaeorum*, lib. iii. c. 9. Further literature in Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 208 sq. Winer *RWB.* ii. 353 sq.

[91] Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 385 sqq. Jost, i. 216–226. Grätz, 3rd ed. iii. 652 sqq., note 10. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 134 sqq. *Sadducäer und Pharisäer*, pp. 13–25. Derenbourg, p. 135 sqq. Kuenen, *De godsdienst van Israël*, ii. 456 sqq. Wellhausen, pp. 56–75. Hamburger, ii. 1047 sqq. Montet, p. 236 sqq.

[92] Against Geiger, see especially Wellhausen, as above.

according to Josephus, the more, and the Pharisees the less severe.[93] This may be connected with the fact that the former strictly adhered to the letter of the law, while the latter sought to mitigate its severity by interpretation. In one point mentioned in the Mishna the Sadducees even went beyond the demands of the law. They required compensation, not only if an ox or an ass (Ex. xxi. 32, 35 sq.), but also if a man-servant or a maid-servant had injured any one.[94] On the other hand, they insisted that false witnesses should be put to death, only when the accused had already been executed in consequence of their false witness (Deut. xix. 19–21), while the Pharisees required that this should take place so soon as sentence had been passed.[95] Thus in this instance the latter were the more severe. These differences were evidently not differences of principle. The same is the case in *questions of ritual*. For here too a difference of principle can only so far be spoken of, that the Sadducees did not regard as binding Pharisaic decrees with respect *e.g.* to clean and unclean. They derided their Pharisaic opponents on account of the oddities and inconsistencies into which their laws of cleanness brought them.[96] On the other hand, the Pharisees pronounced all Sadducees unclean, "if they walk in the ways of their fathers."[97] How far however the Sadducees were from renouncing the principle of Levitical uncleanness in itself,

[93] *Antt.* xx. 9. 1: Σαδδουκαίων, οἵτερ εἰσὶ περὶ τὰς κρίσεις ὠμοὶ παρὰ πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους. *Antt.* xiii. 10. 6: Ἄλλως τε καὶ φύσει πρὸς τὰς κολάσεις ἐπιεικῶς ἔχουσιν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι.

[94] *Jadajim* iv. 7[b]. For the wording of these and the following passages, see above, p. 384 sqq.

[95] *Makkoth* i. 6.

[96] The attacks of the Sadducees upon the Pharisees, mentioned *Jadajim* iv. 6 and 7[a], can only be meant in derision. For the Sadducees would certainly not have gone in for "antagonistic books" defiling the hands (*Jadajim* iv. 6), or for declaring that the "stream" which flows in pouring from a clean vessel into an unclean is clean (*Jadajim* iv. 7[a]). They are only deriding the Pharisees for their peculiarities.

[97] *Nidda* iv. 2.

appears from the fact of their demanding even a higher degree of cleanness for the priests who burnt the red heifer, than the Pharisees did.[98] This last is at the same time the only point in which a certain amount of priestly interest, *i.e.* of interest in priestly cleanness, is perceived. With respect to the festival laws it is mentioned that the "Boethosees" (who must be regarded as a variety of the Sadducees) maintained that the sheaf of first-fruits at the Passover was not to be offered on the second day of the feast, but on the day after the Sabbath in the week of the festival,[99] and that consequently the feast of Pentecost, seven weeks later (Lev. xxiii. 15), was always to be kept on the day after the Sabbath.[100] This difference is however so purely technical, that it merely gives expression to the exegetic view of the Sadducees, who did not acknowledge tradition. It certainly never had any practical importance.[101] The only difference of importance in the law of festivals, and especially in the interpretation of the law of the Sabbath, is that the Sadducees did not acknowledge as binding the confused mass of Pharisaic enactments.[102] The

[98] *Para* iii. 7.

[99] *Menachoth* x. 3. That is to say, that they understood by the שבת, Lev. xxiii. 11, not the first day of the feast, but the weekly Sabbath. The traditional interpretation, which understands by it the first day of the feast, and therefore by "the day after the Sabbath" the second day of the feast, is the correct one. See Wellhausen, pp. 59 sq., 67. Adler, *Pharisäismus und Sadducäismus und ihre differirende Auslegung des* ממחרת השבת (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1878, pp. 522 sqq., 568 sqq., 1879, p. 29 sqq.).

[100] *Chagiga* ii. 4. Those who say עצרת אחר השבת (Pentecost falls on the day after the Sabbath) are indeed here spoken of only in general. But that the Sadducees (Boethosees) are intended must certainly be admitted, according to *Menachoth* x. 3.

[101] Comp. Wellhausen, p. 59 sq.

[102] It might indeed be thought, from *Erubin* vi. 2, that the Sadducees also observed Pharisaic subtleties with respect to the Sabbath. For the case is there assumed as possible, of a Sadducee depositing something, in a manner quite Pharisaic, in an artificially fenced off space for the purpose of securing to himself the right of freer movement therein on the Sabbath day. In truth, however, the connection shows that the Sadducees were

difference in principle then between the two parties *is confined on the whole to this general rejection of Pharisaic tradition by the Sadducees.* All other differences were such as would necessarily result, if the one did not acknowledge the obligation of the other's exegetical tradition. Nor must it be thought, that the Sadducees rejected Pharisaic tradition according to its entire *tenor*. Quite apart from the fact, that since the time of Alexandra they had no longer carried out their views into practice, they also theoretically agreed with Pharisaic tradition in some, perhaps in many particulars. They only denied its *obligation*, and reserved the right of private opinion.

In this rejection of the legal tradition of the Pharisees, the Sadducees represented *the older standpoint.* They stopped at the written law. For them the whole subsequent development was without binding power. They also represented a like, one might say archaic, standpoint by their *religious views*, the chief of which have already been spoken of (vol. ii. p. 12 sqq.) —(1) they refused to believe in a resurrection of the body, and retribution in a future life, nay in any personal continuity of the individual; (2) they denied angels and spirits; (3) lastly, they maintained, "that good and evil are at the choice of man, who can do the one or the other at his discretion," and consequently, that God exercises no influence upon human actions, and that man is therefore himself the cause of his own prosperity and adversity.[103] With regard to the two first points, the Sadducees undoubtedly represented the original standpoint of

among those who did not observe the "law of *Erub.*" The purpose of a Sadducee in such an action could only have been to annoy his Pharisaic neighbour, who was thus deprived of the space so occupied by the Sadducee.

[103] Halévy, *Traces d'aggadot saducéennes dans le Talmud* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1884, pp. 38–56), tries to point out traces of these Sadducaean views even in the Talmud. They are, however, very indistinct.

the Old Testament, in distinction from the later Jewish. For with the exception of the Book of Daniel the Old Testament also knows of no resurrection of the body, and no retribution in another world in the sense of later Judaism, that is to say, no personal salvation of the individual after this earthly life, nor any punishment in the world to come for the sins of this life, but only a shadowy continued existence in Sheol. So too is the belief in angels and demons, in the development which it subsequently attained, still foreign to the Old Testament. The Sadducees then in both these respects remained essentially at the more ancient standpoint. Only we must not indeed say, that their special motive was the conservative feature, the cleaving to the old as such. On the contrary, it is evident that a certain amount of *worldliness* was the result of the superior political position of the Sadducees. Their interests were entirely in this world, and they had no such intensively religious interest as the Pharisees. Hence it was their slighter amount of religious energy which made the older standpoint seem sufficient for them. Nay, it is probable that in their case, as men of rank and culture, *illuministic motives* also intervened. The more fantastically the imaginary religious sphere of Judaism was fashioned, the less were they able to follow the course of its development. It is from this point of view indeed that the stress laid by the Sadducees on human freedom is chiefly to be explained. If the statements of Josephus on this point are on the whole worthy of credence, we can only perceive in this stronger insistance upon liberty also, a recession of the religious motive. They insisted that man was placed at his own disposal, and rejected the thought that a divine co-operation takes place in human actions as such.

The last-named particulars also show in part, how it was just the high aristocracy that acceded to the tendency designated as "Sadducean." In order to understand the genesis of this

tendency, we must start from the fact, that the whole conduct of political affairs was already in the Persian, but especially in the Greek period, in the hands of the priestly aristocracy. The high priest was chief of the State, eminent priests undoubtedly stood at the head of the Gerusia (the Sanhedrim of the day). The duties of the priestly aristocracy were therefore quite as much political as religious. This necessarily involved a very real regard to political interests and points of view in all their proceedings. But the more decidedly these came to the foreground, the more did those of religion recede. This seems to have been especially the case in the Greek period, and indeed for this reason, that political interests were now combined with *Greek culture.* They who then wanted to effect anything in the political world must of necessity stand on a more or less friendly footing with Hellenism. Thus Hellenism gained ground more and more in the higher ranks of the priesthood at Jerusalem, which was in the same proportion alienated from the Jewish religious interest. Hence it is comprehensible, that it was just in these circles that Antiochus Epiphanes most easily found an admission of his demands. A portion of the priests of rank were even ready without further ceremony to exchange Jewish for heathen rites. This triumph of heathenism was not indeed of long continuance, the Maccabaean rising putting a speedy end to it. Still the tendencies of the priestly aristocracy remained essentially the same. Though there was no longer any talk of heathen rites, though the special friends of the Greeks were either expelled or silenced, there was still among the priestly aristocracy the same worldly-mindedness and the same at least comparative laxity of interest in religion. On the other hand, however, a revival and strengthening of religious life was the result of the Maccabaean rising. The rigidly legal party of the " Chasidees " gained more and more influence. And therewith their pretensions also increased.

Those only were to be acknowledged as true Israelites who observed the law according to the full strictness of the interpretation given to it by the scribes. But the more strenuously this demand was made, the more decided was the recusancy of the aristocrats. It seems as though it were just the religious revival of the Maccabaean period which led to a firmer consolidation of parties. The "Chasidees" were consistent with their principles, and became "*Pharisees.*" *The high aristocracy rejected the results that had been reached during the last few centuries in both the interpretation of the law and the development of religious views.* They saw in the παράδοσις τῶν πρεσβυτέρων an excess of legal strictness which they refused to have imposed upon them, while the advanced religious views were, on the one hand, superfluous to their worldly-mindedness, and on the other, inadmissible by their higher culture and enlightenment. The heads of this party belonging to the ancient priestly race of the Zadokites, they and their followers were called Zadokites or Sadducees by their opponents.

Under the earlier Maccabees (Judas, Jonathan, and Simon) this "Zadokite" aristocracy was necessarily in the background. The ancient high-priestly family which, at least in some of its members, represented the extreme philo-Hellenistic standpoint, was supplanted. The high-priestly office remained for a time unoccupied. In the year 152, Jonathan was appointed high priest, and thus was founded the new high-priestly dynasty of the Asmonaeans, whose whole past compelled them at first to support the rigidly legal party. Nevertheless there was not in the times of the first Asmonaeans (Jonathan, Simon) an entire withdrawal of the Sadducees from the scene. The old aristocracy was indeed purged from its more extreme philo-Grecian elements, but did not therefore at once wholly disappear. The Asmonaean parvenus had to come to some kind of understanding with it, and to yield to it at least a

portion of seats in the "Gerusia." Things remained in this position till the time of John Hyrcanus, when the Sadducees again became the really ruling party, John Hyrcanus, Aristobulus I., and Alexander Jannaeus becoming their followers. The reaction under Alexandra brought the Pharisees back to power. Their *political* supremacy was however of no long duration. Greatly as the spiritual power of the Pharisees had increased, the Sadducean aristocracy were able to keep at the helm in politics, and that notwithstanding the overthrow of the Asmonaeans and Herod's proscriptions of the ancient nobility who had leagued with them. The high-priestly families of the Herodian-Roman period belonged also to the Sadducean party. This is decidedly testified for at least the Roman period.[104] The price at which the Sadducees had to secure themselves power at this later period was indeed a high one, for they were obliged in their official actions actually to accommodate themselves to Pharisaic views. "Nothing is, so to speak, done by them, for whenever they obtain office they adhere, though unwillingly and by constraint, to what the Pharisees say, as otherwise the multitude would not tolerate them."[105]

With the fall of the Jewish State the Sadducees altogether disappear from history. Their strong point was politics. When deprived of this their last hour had struck. While the Pharisaic party only gained more strength, only obtained more absolute rule over the Jewish people in consequence of the collapse of political affairs, the very ground on which they

[104] Acts v. 17. Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 9. 1.

[105] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4. It is a complete misunderstanding to read from these words that the Sadducees only took office unwillingly (so even Winer, *RWB.* p. 356). On the contrary, they eagerly strove for it. The words ἀκουσίως μὲν καὶ κατ' ἀνάγκας are, as the μέν and δέ prove, to be combined with those which follow. Comp. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 108, note. The same, *Sadducäer und Pharisäer*, p. 13. Hanne, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* Keim, i. 282, note. Wellhausen, p. 45.

stood was cut away from the Sadducees. Hence it is not to be wondered, that Jewish scholars soon no longer even knew who the Sadducees really were. In the Mishna we still find some trustworthy traditions concerning them; but the Talmudic period, properly so called, has but a very misty notion of them.

## § 27. SCHOOL AND SYNAGOGUE.

"THE people which knoweth not the law is accursed" (John vii. 49). Such was the fundamental conviction of post-exilian Judaism. And this of itself implies that a knowledge of the law was esteemed as the possession worthy above all others to be striven after. Hence the exhortation: To the law! is sounded abroad in every key. Joses ben Joeser said: Let your house be a house of assembly for those wise in the law (חֲכָמִים); let yourself be dusted by the dust of their feet, and drink eagerly their teaching.[1] Joshua ben Perachiah said: Get thyself a teacher (רַב).[2] Shammai said: Make the study of the law thy special business (קְבַע).[3] Rabban Gamaliel said: Appoint for thyself a teacher, so wilt thou avoid what is doubtful.[4] Hillel said: An ignorant man cannot be truly pious (לֹא עַם הָאָרֶץ חָסִיד).[5] He also said: The more teaching of the law, the more life; the more school, the more wisdom; the more counsel, the more reasonable action. He who gains a knowledge of the law gains life in the world to come.[6] R. Joses ha-Kohen said: Give thyself the trouble to learn the law, for it is not obtained by inheritance.[7] R. Eleasar ben Arach said: Be diligent in the study of the law.[8] R. Chananiah ben Teradion said: When two sit together and do not converse about the law, they are an assembly of scorners, of which it is said: sit not in the seat of scorners. When however two sit together and converse about the law, the Shechinah is present among them.[9] R. Simon said: When three eat together at one table

[1] *Aboth* i. 4. [2] *Aboth* i. 6. [3] *Aboth* i. 15.
[4] *Aboth* i. 16. [5] *Aboth* ii. 5. [6] *Aboth* ii. 7.
[7] *Aboth* ii. 12. [8] *Aboth* ii. 14. [9] *Aboth* iii. 2; comp. iii. 6.

and do not converse about the law, it is as though they ate of the offerings of the dead. But when three eat together at one table and converse about the law, it is as though they ate at the table of God.[10] R. Simon said: He who in walking repeats the law to himself, but interrupts himself and exclaims, How beautiful is this tree! How beautiful is this field! the Scripture will impute it to him as though he had forfeited his life.[11] R. Nehorai said: Always travel towards a place where there is instruction in the law, and say not that it will come after thee, or that thy companions will preserve it for thee; also depend not upon thine own acuteness.[12] The same R. Nehorai said: I lay aside all the trade of the world, and teach my son only the law, for its reward is enjoyed in this world, and the capital (הַקֶּרֶן) remains for the world to come.[13] The following things have no measure: the Peah, the first-fruits, pilgrimage, benevolence, the study of the law. The following are things whose interest (פֵּירוֹת) is enjoyed in this world, while the capital (הַקֶּרֶן) remains for the world to come: reverence for fathers and mothers, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and *the study of the law above them all.*[14] A bastard who knows the law takes precedence of a high priest if he is ignorant.[15]

Such an estimation of the law would necessarily impel to the employment of every possible means for bestowing upon the whole people the benefit of the most thorough knowledge and practice of the law. What the Pharisaic scribes had established in their schools as the law of Israel, was to become both in theory and practice the common possession of the whole nation. For both the *knowledge* and *practice* of

[10] *Aboth* iii. 2. [11] *Aboth* iii. 7. [12] *Aboth* iv. 14.
[13] *Kiddushin* iv. 14. [14] *Peah* i. 1.
[15] *Horajoth* iii. 8. Comp. on the necessity and value of the study of the law, Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880), pp. 28–31.

the law were required. Josephus boasts of it as an excellence of the Israelitish nation, that in their case neither one nor the other received a one-sided preference, as in the case of the Spartans, who educated by custom, not by instruction (ἔθεσιν ἐπαίδευον, οὐ λόγοις), and, on the other hand, of the Athenians and other Greeks, who contented themselves with theoretic instruction, and neglected practice. "But our lawgiver very carefully combined the two. For he neither left the practice of morals silent, nor the teaching of the law unperformed."[16] The instruction which formed the prerequisite of practice began in early youth, and continued during the whole life of the Israelite. The care of its foundation rested with the *school* and *family*, that of its farther carrying on with the *synagogue*.

## I. THE SCHOOL.

### The Literature.

Ursinus, *Antiquitates Hebraicae Scholastico-Academicae*, Hafniae 1702 (also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

Pacht, *De eruditione Judaica* (*dissertatio, quam praeside A. G. Waehnero examini submittet auctor J. L. Pacht*), Gotting. 1742. It specially treats, pp. 50–55: de ludis puerorum.

Andr. Georg Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, vol. ii. (Gottingae 1742), pp. 783–804: de eruditione Ebraeorum.

Aut. Theod. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des A. T. mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 377–384.

Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, i. 186–192.

Winer, *BWB.*, arts. "Kinder" and "Unterricht." Still more literature is here given.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 243, 266–268.

Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, i. 424 sqq.

Diestel, art. "Erziehung," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* ii. 172 sq.

[16] *Contra Apion.* ii. 16–17.

Ginsburg, art. "Education," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.*
S. R. Hirsch, *Aus dem rabbinischen Schulleben.* Frankf. a. M. 1871 (Progr.).
Elias van Gelder, *Die Volksschule des jüdischen Alterthums nach talmudischen und rabbinischen Quellen.* Berl. 1872 (Leipziger Dissertat.).
Leop. Löw, *Die Lebensalter in der jüdischen Literatur* (Szegedin 1875), pp. 195 sqq., 407 sqq.
Mos. Jacobson, *Versuch einer Psychologie des Talmud* (Hamburg 1878), pp. 93–101.
Jos. Simon, *L'éducation et l'instruction des enfants chez les anciens Juifs d'après la Bible et le Talmud*, 3rd ed. Leipzig 1879, O. Schulze.
Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. i. art. "Erziehung," Div. ii. arts. "Lehrer," "Mizwa," "Schule," "Schüler," "Unterricht."

According to the statement of Josephus, Moses had already prescribed "that boys should learn the most important laws, because this is the best knowledge and the cause of prosperity."[17] "He commanded to instruct children in the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), to teach them to walk according to the laws, and to know the deeds of their forefathers. The latter, that they might imitate them; the former, that growing up with the laws they might not transgress them, nor have the excuse of ignorance."[18] Josephus repeatedly commends the zeal with which the instruction of the young was carried on. "We take most pains of all with the instruction of children, and esteem the observation of the laws and the piety corresponding with them the most important affair of our whole life."[19] "If any one should question one of us concerning the laws, he would more easily repeat

[17] *Antt.* iv. 8. 12: Μανθανέτωσαν δὲ καὶ οἱ παῖδες πρώτους τοὺς νόμους μάθημα κάλλιστον καὶ τῆς εὐδαιμονίας αἴτιον.

[18] *Apion.* ii. 25: Καὶ γράμματα παιδεύειν ἐκέλευσε [*scil.* τοὺς παῖδας], περί τε τοὺς νόμους ἀναστρέφεσθαι καὶ τῶν προγόνων τὰς πράξεις ἐπίστασθαι, τὰς μὲν ἵνα μιμῶνται, τοῖς δ' ἵνα συντρεφόμενοι μήτε παραβαίνωσι μήτε σκῆψιν ἀγνοίας ἔχωσι. On γράμματα = the elements of knowledge (reading and writing), see Passow's *WB. s.v.*

[19] *Apion.* i. 12: Μάλιστα δὲ πάντων περὶ παιδοτροφίαν φιλοκαλοῦντες, καὶ τὸ φυλάττειν τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὴν κατὰ τούτους παραδεδομένην εὐσέβειαν ἔργον ἀναγκαιότατον παντὸς τοῦ βίου πεποιημένοι.

all than his own name. Since we learn them *from our first consciousness*, we have them, as it were, engraven on our souls; and a transgression is rare, but the averting of punishment impossible."[20] In like manner does Philo express himself: "Since the Jews esteem their laws as divine revelations, and are instructed in the knowledge of them from their *earliest youth*, they bear the image of the law in their souls."[21] "They are taught, so to speak, from their *swaddling-clothes* by their parents, teachers, and those who bring them up, even before instruction in the sacred laws and the unwritten customs, to believe in God the one Father and Creator of the world."[22] Josephus boasts of himself, that in his fourteenth year he had already so accurate an acquaintance with the law, that the high priest and chief men of Jerusalem used to come to him to learn particulars respecting the law.[23] In view of all this testimony it cannot be doubted, that in the circles of genuine Judaism boys were from their tenderest childhood made acquainted with the demands of the law.[24] That this education in the law was, in the first place, the duty and task of parents is self-evident. But it appears, that even in the age of Christ, care was also taken for the instruction of youth by the erection of schools on the part of the community. It does not indeed say much, when later tradition tells us that

[20] *Apion.* ii. 18: Ἡμῶν δ' ὀντινοῦν εἴ τις ἔροιτο τοὺς νόμους, ῥᾷον ἂν εἴποι πάντας ἢ τοὔνομα τὸ ἑαυτοῦ. Τοιγαροῦν ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης εὐθὺς αἰσθήσεως αὐτοὺς ἐκμανθάνοντες ἔχομεν ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ὥσπερ ἐγκεχαραγμένους, καὶ σπάνιος μὲν ὁ παραβαίνων, ἀδύνατος δ' ἡ τῆς κολάσεως παραίτησις.

[21] *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31, Mang. ii. 577. Θεόχρηστα γὰρ λόγια τοὺς νόμους εἶναι ὑπολαμβάνοντες, καὶ τοῦτο ἐκ πρώτης ἡλικίας τὸ μάθημα παιδευθέντες, ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς ἀγαλματοφοροῦσι τὰς τῶν διατεταγμένων εἰκόνας.

[22] *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31, Mang. ii. 577: Δεδιδαγμένους ἐξ αὐτῶν τρόπον τινὰ σπαργάνων ὑπὸ γονέων καὶ παιδαγωγῶν καὶ ὑφηγητῶν, καὶ πολὺ πρότερον τῶν ἱερῶν νόμων καὶ ἔτι τῶν ἀγράφων ἐθῶν, ἕνα νομίζειν τὸν πατέρα καὶ ποιητὴν τοῦ κόσμου θεόν.

[23] *Vita*, 2.

[24] In Christian communities also children were instructed in the Holy Scriptures. Comp. 2 Tim. iii. 15: ἀπὸ βρέφους ἱερὰ γράμματα οἶδας.

Simon ben Shetach already prescribed that children (תינוקות) should frequent the elementary schools (בית הספר).[25] For this Simon ben Shetach is quite a point of meeting for all kinds of myths. In any case however, in the period of the Mishna, and therefore at latest in the second century after Christ, the existence of elementary schools is assumed. There are *e.g.* legal decisions with regard to the חַזָּן (servant of the congregation), who instructs children (תינוקות) in reading on the Sabbath.[26] Or it is ordained, that an idle man shall not keep a school for children, לא ילמוד אדם רוק סופרים.[27] Or it is appointed, that in certain cases the testimony of an adult with respect to what he saw as a child (קטן) in the elementary school (בית הספר) is valid.[28] Hence the later tradition, that Joshua ben Gamla (=Jesus the son of Gamaliel) enacted that teachers of boys (מלמדי תינוקות) should be appointed *in every province and in every town*, and that children of the age of six or seven should be brought to them, is by no means incredible.[29] The only Jesus the son of Gamaliel known to history is the high priest of that name, about 63–65 after Christ (see above, vol. i. p. 201). It must therefore be he who is intended in the above notice. As his measures presuppose a somewhat longer existence of boys' schools, we may without

[25] *Jer. Kethuboth* viii. 11 (32c above).

[26] *Shabbath* i. 3.

[27] *Kiddushin* iv. 13.

[28] *Kethuboth* ii. 10.

[29] *Bab. Baba bathra* 21a: "Rab Judah said in the name of the Rabbi: Truly it may be remembered to this man's credit! Joshua ben Gamla is his name. If he had not lived, the law would have been forgotten in Israel. For at first, he who had a father was taught the law by him, he who had none did not learn the law. . . . Afterwards it was ordained, that teachers of boys should be appointed in Jerusalem. . . . But he who had a father was sent to school by him, he who had none did not go there. Then it was ordained, that teachers should be appointed in every province, and that boys of the age of sixteen or seventeen should be sent to them. But he whose teacher was angry with him ran away, till Joshua ben Gamla came and enacted, that teachers should be appointed in every province and in every town (בכל מדינה ומדינה ובכל עיר ועיר), and children of six or seven years old brought to them."

hesitation transfer them to the age of Christ, even though not as a general and established institution.

The *subject of instruction*, as already appears from the above passages of Josephus and Philo, was as good as exclusively the law. For only its inculcation in the youthful mind, and not the means of general education, was the aim of all this zeal for the instruction of youth. And indeed the earliest instruction was in the reading and inculcation of the *text of Scripture*. Hence the elementary school was called simply the בֵּית הַסֵּפֶר, because it had to do with the book of the Thorah, or as is once expressly declared, with the text of Scripture (the מִקְרָא) in distinction from בֵּית הַמִּדְרָשׁ, which was devoted to further "study."[30] It was therefore at bottom only the interest in the law, which made instruction in reading pretty widely diffused. For since in the case of the written Scripture (in distinction from oral tradition) great importance was attached to its being actually *read* (see below on the order of public worship), elementary instruction in the law was necessarily combined with instruction in reading. A knowledge of reading must therefore be everywhere assumed, where a somewhat more thorough knowledge of the law existed. Hence we find even in pre-Christian times *books of the law* in the possession of private individuals.[31] On the other hand however the difficult art of writing was less general.[32]

Habitual practice went hand in hand with theoretical instruction. For though children were not actually *bound* to fulfil the law, they were yet accustomed to it from their youth

[30] *Jer. Megilla* iii. 1 (73a): "R. Pinchas said in the name of R. Hoshaiah that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem, and each had a Beth-Sefer and a Beth-Talmud, the former for the *Mikra* (the text of Scripture), the latter for the *Mishna* (the oral tradition)."

[31] Comp. 1 Macc. i. 56 sq. In the Mishna, *Jebamoth* xvi. 7, a story is told of a Levite, who died on a journey, in an inn, and whose property consisted of a stick, a travelling-bag, and a *book of the law*.

[32] Comp. Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Schreibkunst."

up. It was made a duty of adults *e.g.* to enjoin children to keep the Sabbath.[33] Children were to be gradually accustomed to strict fasting on the day of atonement one or two years before the age when it was incumbent.[33a] Certain points were even binding upon children. They were not bound indeed *e.g.* to the reading of the Shema and the putting on of Tephillin, but they were so to the usual prayer (the Shemoneh Esreh) and to prayer at table.[34] Boys had to be present at the tenderest age in the temple at the chief festivals.[35] Especially were boys bound to the observance of the feast of Tabernacles.[36] As soon then as the first signs of manhood appeared, the growing Israelite was bound to the full observance of the law,[37] he then entered upon all the rights and duties of a full-grown Israelite, and was henceforth a בַּר מִצְוָה.[38] Thus the widely-diffused opinion, supported

[33] *Shabbath* xvi. 6. [33a] *Joma* viii. 4.

[34] *Berachoth* iii. 3: "Women, slaves and children are released from reading the Shema and from the Tephillin, but are bound to the Tephilla (the Shemoneh Esreh), to the Mesusa, and prayer at table."

[35] *Chagiga* i. 1: "Every one is bound to appear in the temple at the chief feasts, except the deaf, idiots, children, eunuchs, mongrels, women, unemancipated slaves, the lame, blind, sick, infirm, and generally those who cannot walk. *What is here meant by a child* (קָטֹן)? According to the school of Shammai: Every one who cannot yet ride upon his father's shoulder from Jerusalem to the temple mount. But the school of Hillel said: Every one who cannot yet go up from Jerusalem to the temple mount led by his father's hand." It may indeed be inferred from Luke ii. 42, that as a rule those dwelling away from Jerusalem took part in the pilgrimages from their twelfth year.

[36] *Sukka* ii. 8: "Women, slaves and children are free from the law of the feast of Tabernacles. A child however, who no longer needs his mother, is bound by it. The daughter-in-law of Shammai the elder once brought forth a son at the feast of Tabernacles. He then left the roof open and covered it in over the bed with branches for the sake of the child." *Sukka* iii. 15: "A boy who is capable of shaking the *lulab* is bound to keep it."

[37] *Nidda* vi. 11: "A boy in whom the two hairs appear *is bound to all the commands which are said in the law.*" The like applies to girls, with the difference, that women neither share in all the rights nor in all the legal duties of men.

[38] The expression Bar-Mizvah is found already in the Talmud (*Baba*

especially by the remarks of Lightfoot and Wetzstein on Luke ii. 42, that the attainment of the twelfth year formed the boundary between being bound and not bound to the observance of the law, is in two respects inaccurate: first, because a younger boy was bound by certain precepts, and next because no definite age but the signs of approaching puberty formed this boundary. Besides, when a definite age was subsequently fixed, it was not that of twelve, but of thirteen years.[39]

## II. THE SYNAGOGUE.

### The Literature.

Maimonides, Hilchoth Tephilla (in his great work Mishne Thorah), gives a systematic statement of such tradition concerning the nature of the synagogue as was held valid in his time.

---

*mezia* 96a below, see Levy's *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 258b), but was not generally used as the designation of a full-grown Israelite till the Middle Ages, see Löw, *Die Lebensalter*, pp. 210, 410.

[39] Thus in the appendix (a work of the post-Talmudic period) to the treatise Aboth, *Aboth* v. 21: "At five years old (he comes) to the reading of Scripture, at ten to the Mishna, at *thirteen* (בן שלש עשרה) to the *practice of the commands*, at fifteen to the Talmud, at eighteen to marriage," etc. In a special point, viz. the absolute validity of the oath, the attainment of the thirteenth year was also already appointed in the Mishna; see *Nidda* v. 6: "When a child is twelve years and one day old, his oaths are tested; when he is thirteen years and a day, they are valid without further ceremony." Comp. Löw, *Die Lebensalter*, p. 143 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Mizva." The material contributed by Lightfoot (*Horae hebr.*) and Wetzstein (*Nov. Test.*) on Luke ii. 42 does not prove, that the twelfth year formed the boundary between obligation and non-obligation. On the one hand, only the views of individual authorities, which are opposed by other authorities, are on the whole dealt with; and on the other it is only said by them, that the strict *practice* of the law had to begin at twelve years of age, not that its *obligation* then began; so especially in the passages *Joma* 82a, *Kethuboth* 50a. Nor can more be inferred from Luke ii. 42, than that at the age of twelve the strict *practice* of the law began.

Vitringa, *De synagoga vetere libri tres: quibus tum de nominibus, structura, origine, praefectis, ministris et sacris synagogarum agitur, tum praecipue formam regiminis et ministerii earum in ecclesiam christianum translatam esse demonstratur*, Franequerae 1696.

Joh. Gottl. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico criticus* (1748), pp. 307–326.

A number of older monographs on single subjects is collected in Ugolini's *Thesaurus Antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxi.

Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Testaments mit dem Neuen* (1831), pp. 225–376.

Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden* (1832), pp. 1–12, 329–360.

Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 548–551, "Synagogen."

Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 129–137, 183–226.

Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 168 ff.

Keil, *Handbuch der biblischen Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 164 ff., 444 ff.

Leyrer, art. "Synagogen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xv. (1862), pp. 299–314.

De Wette, *Lehrb. der hebr.-jüd. Archäologie* (4th ed. 1864), pp. 369–374.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. vol. i. (1873) pp. 73–80.

Haneberg, *Die religiösen Alterthümer der Bibel* (1869), pp. 349–355, 582–587.

Ginsburg, art. "Synagogue," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature*.

Plumptre, art. "Synagogue," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible*.

Kneucker, art. "Synagogen," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. pp. 443–446.

Sieffert, *Die jüdische Synagoge zur Zeit Jesu* (*Beweis des Glaubens*, 1876, pp. 3–11, 225–239).

Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. 1883, art. "Synagoge."

Löw, Leop., *Der synagogale Ritus* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, pp. 97 ff., 161 ff., 214 ff., 305 ff., 364 ff., 458 ff.).

Strack, art. "Synagogen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xv. 96–100.

A deeper and more professional acquaintance with the law could only be obtained at the feet of the scribes in the Beth-ha-Midrash (see above, § 25). It was in the nature of things, that only a small fraction would acquire this. For the bulk of the people it was no small advantage, if only an elementary knowledge should become and remain a common property. But even this object was only attainable through an institution,

by means of which the law was being brought nearer and nearer during his whole life to each individual of the nation. Such an institution was created by post-exilian Judaism in the custom of the reading of Scripture on the Sabbath day in the synagogue. For it is necessary first of all to remark, that the *main object* of these Sabbath day assemblages in the synagogue was not public worship in its stricter sense, *i.e.* not devotion, but religious instruction, and this for an Israelite was above all *instruction in the law.* Josephus rightly views the matter in this light: "Not once or twice or more frequently did our lawgiver command us to hear the law, but to come together weekly, with the cessation of other work, to hear the law and to learn it accurately."[40] Nor was Philo in the wrong, when he called the synagogues "houses of instruction," in which "the native philosophy" was studied and every kind of virtue taught.[41] In the New Testament too, the *διδάσκειν* always figures as the chief function of the synagogue.[42] The *origin* of these meetings on the Sabbath in buildings erected for the purpose, must at any rate be sought for in the post-exilian period. The first traces of them are the מוֹעֲדֵי אֵל of Ps. lxxiv. 8, probably of the Maccabaean era. But their commencement may well be transposed considerably farther back, perhaps to the time of Ezra. In the times of Christ

[40] *Apion.* ii. 7: Οὐκ εἰσάπαξ ἀκροασαμένους οὐδὲ δὶς ἢ πολλάκις, ἀλλ ἑκάστης ἑβδομάδος τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων ἀφεμένους ἐπὶ τὴν ἀκρόασιν τοῦ νόμου ἐκέλευσε συλλέγεσθαι καὶ τοῦτον ἀκριβῶς ἐκμανθάνειν.

[41] *Vita Mosis*, iii. 27 (Mang. ii. 168): Ἀφ' οὗ καὶ εἰσέτι νῦν Φιλοσοφοῦσι ταῖς ἑβδόμαις Ἰουδαῖοι τὴν πάτριον Φιλοσοφίαν, τὸν χρόνον ἐκεῖνον ἀναθέντες ἐπιστήμῃ καὶ θεωρίᾳ τῶν περὶ Φύσιν. Τὰ γὰρ κατὰ πόλεις προσευκτήρια τί ἕτερόν ἐστιν ἢ διδασκαλεῖα Φρονήσεως καὶ ἀνδρίας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ δικαιοσύνης, εὐσεβείας τε καὶ ὁσιότητος καὶ συμπάσης ἀρετῆς, ἢ κατανοεῖται καὶ κατορθοῦται τά τε ἀνθρώπεια καὶ θεῖα. Comp. *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568): Ἠπίστατο οὖν (*scil.* Augustus of the Roman Jews) καὶ προσευχὰς ἔχοντας καὶ συνιόντας εἰς αὐτὰς, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἑβδόμαις, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ τὴν πάτριον παιδεύονται Φιλοσοφίαν.

[42] Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 21; Luke iv. 15, 31, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59, xviii. 20.

the "teaching in the synagogue on the Sabbath day" was already an established and naturalized institution (Mark i. 21, vi. 2; Luke iv. 16, 31, vi. 6, xiii. 10; Acts xiii. 14, 27, 42, 44, xv. 21, xvi. 13, xvii. 2, xviii. 4). According to Acts xv. 21, Moses "had from generations of old (ἐκ γενεῶν ἀρχαίων) in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every Sabbath." Josephus and Philo, and subsequent Judaism in general, trace back the whole system to Moses himself.[43] This is indeed of interest only as showing that later Judaism regarded it as an essential element of its religious institutions. The utter absence of testimony forbids our thinking of a pre-exilian origin.

The whole system presupposes above all things the existence of a *religious community*. And here the question arises, whether in the time of Christ the civil and religious community was so separated in the towns and provinces of Palestine, that the latter possessed an independent organization. To gain clearness on the subject, we must first consider that the political constitution differed in the different towns of Palestine. We have seen (vol. i. p. 148) that a *threefold variety* was in this respect possible, and actually existed. The

[43] Comp. besides the two already cited passages (Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 17; Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 27), especially Philo, *fragm. apud Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7, in Vitringa, p. 283 sqq. The statement of Winer (*RWB.* ii. 548, referring to his *Diss. de Jonathanis in Pentat. paraphrasi chald.* i. 30), that the Targums transfer the institution to the patriarchal period, is not quite correct. It is certainly said in Onkelos, Gen. xxv. 27, that Jacob served in a house of instruction (בית אולפנא), and in *Targ. Jerus.* 1, Gen. xxxiii. 17, that Jacob built a house of teaching (בי מדרשא). But in neither case is a *synagogue* proper intended. In *Targ. Jerus.* 1, Ex. xviii. 20, it is said, that the father-in-law of Moses exhorted him to teach the people the prayer, which they were to use in their synagogue (בבית כנישתהון). But here the age of the patriarchs in the stricter sense is out of question. So too do the other passages quoted by Winer equally refer to a later period. It would nevertheless be quite in accordance with the spirit of the Targums to transpose the synagogues also to the times of the patriarchs.

Jews might be excluded from civic rights, or Jews and non-Jews might have equal civil rights, or Jews only might be in possession of them. The first two cases were possible in towns with a chiefly Greek or strongly mixed population. In both cases the Jews would, in respect of their religious wants, be thrown back upon self-organization as a religious community. For whether they co-operated or not in the direction of civil affairs, the necessity of independent organization for religious matters was the same. *In both these cases therefore the question stated must be answered in the affirmative,* and consequently the position of the synagogal community would be the same in these towns as in those of the Dispersion. Quite different however was the state of affairs in towns of an entirely or an almost exclusively Jewish population. Here the local authorities certainly consisted of Jews, and the few non-Jewish inhabitants were excluded from the college of elders or town senate. Of this there is no doubt with respect to Jerusalem. Since then the local authorities had often to deal also with religious affairs (for the Jewish law knows of no severance of these from civil affairs), it is *a priori* very probable, that the matters of the synagogue were under their jurisdiction. Or would a separate council of elders be appointed for this special purpose? In small places at all events this would have been very unnatural. But even in the larger towns, where there were several synagogues, there was no occasion for it. It was enough if the necessary *officials* for each synagogue (a ruler of the synagogue, an almoner and a minister), who had to care for its special concerns, were appointed by the local authorities. At least there was no urgent reason for the formation of a college of elders for each separate synagogue, though with the scantiness of our material we have to concede the possibility of this being done. Nay, in one case it is even probable; for the Hellenistic Jews in Jerusalem, the Liber-

tines, Cyrenians, Cilicians and Asiatics evidently formed separate communities (Acts vi. 9).[44] But these were special circumstances, the difference of nationality making a special organization necessary. A separation of the political and religious community would have been quite unnatural for the simple circumstances especially of the smaller places of Palestine. It would disagree with the character of post-exilian Judaism, which indeed knows of the political, only in the form of the religious community. But there are not wanting also positive proofs, that the civil community as such also directed the affairs of the synagogue. In the Mishna *e.g.* it is presupposed as quite self-evident, that the synagogue, the sacred ark, and the sacred books were quite as much the property of the town, and therefore of the civic community, as *e.g.* the roads and the bathing establishment.[45] The inhabitants of the town (בְּנֵי הָעִיר) had therefore the right of disposing of the former as of the latter.[46] When Eleasar ben Asariah says, that the Musaph-prayer may only be used in a town congregation (בְּחֶבֶר עִיר), we may infer that the town congregation included the civic community as such in the synagogue

[44] The Λιβερτῖνοι can only be Roman "freed men" and their descendants, therefore descendants of those Jews, whom Pompey despatched as prisoners to Rome, and who were there soon liberated by their masters (Philo, *Leg. ad Cajum*, § 23. M. ii. 568). Many of these may have subsequently returned to Jerusalem and have here formed a separate congregation. So too the numerous Hellenistic Jews from Cyrene, Alexandria, Cilicia and Asia dwelling in Jerusalem formed separate congregations. For the old matter of dispute as to how the passage from the Acts is to be construed, whether so as to make it mention *one* or *two* or *five* synagogues, must certainly be decided in the latter sense (so already, Vitringa, p. 253).

[45] *Nedarim* v. 5: "Things which belong to a town are *e.g.* the roads, the bathing institution, the synagogue, the sacred chest or ark, the sacred books."

[46] *Megilla* iii. 1: "If the inhabitants of a town have sold the open place of the town, they may with the produce buy a synagogue; if a synagogue, then a sacred ark; if a sacred ark, then veils for the Holy Scriptures; if these, then the Holy Scriptures; if these, then a book of the law."

worship.[47] We may consequently assume it as probable that the congregation of the synagogue had only in towns with a mixed population an independent existence beside the political community. *In purely Jewish localities, the elders of the place will have been also the elders of the synagogue.* So far as the community is viewed as religious, it is called כְּנֶסֶת (properly assembly, Greek *συναγωγή*, Aramaean כנישתא), its members therefore בְּנֵי הַכְּנֶסֶת.[48]

[47] *Berachoth* iv. 7: "R. Eleasar ben Asariah says: The Musaph-prayer (that added to the usual prayer on Sabbaths and holy days) is only used in a town congregation. The learned say: In a town congregation and outside one. R. Judah says in the name of the latter: Wherever there is a town congregation, an individual is free from the Musaph-prayer." The unusual word חבר עיר is, it is true, variously explained. Since however it means in any case an associated community (not as Maimonides explains it, an individual scholar), and since the religious community is elsewhere called, not חבר, but כנסת, חבר must mean just a civil associated community, which also very well suits the passage cited from *Megilla* 27b, by Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.*

[48] *Bechoroth* v. 5; *Sabim* iii. 2. כְּנֶסֶת must be written, not with Segol, but with Tsere in the penultimate. Comp. the Aramaic כנישתא, and *Cod. de Rossi* 138, where indeed כְּנֵסֶת is not quite constantly but still in most passages correctly pointed. The Greek *συναγωγή* is used in the sense of "congregation," *e.g.* Acts vi. 9, ix. 2. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. Add. n. 2114b, 2114bb (Inscriptions of the Pantikapaion in the Cimmerian Bosphorus): *συνεπιτροπεύσης τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων.* Frequently in Roman-Judaic epitaphs. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 sqq. That it was in later Judaism the usual expression for "congregation" is evident, especially from the language of the Fathers, who only distinguish between *συναγωγή* and *ἐκκλησία* to make the former signify the Jewish, the latter the Christian congregation. Nay the Ebionites retained the expression *συναγωγή* for the Christian congregation also (Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 18: *συναγωγὴν δὲ οὗτοι καλοῦσι τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐκκλησίαν καὶ οὐχὶ ἐκκλησίαν*). And even in patristic literature *συναγωγή* is sometimes used for the Christian congregation (see Harnack, *Zeitschr. für Wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1876, p. 104 sqq., and his note on *Hermas Mandat.* xi. 9, in Gebhardt and Harnack's edition of the *Patr. Apostol.*). In Christian Palestinian Aramaic, כנישתא, which answers to the Greek *συναγωγή*, seems to have been the usual word for "church" (see Land, *Anecdota Syriaca*, iv. 217. Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron*, p. 335). Still in the Christian sphere *ἐκκλησία* has certainly from the first, even from the time of St. Paul, maintained the supremacy. This contrast between the Jewish and Christian usage of

The *authority of the elders of the community* in religious matters must be conceived of as analogous to that which they possessed in civil affairs. As then the civil administration and jurisdiction were entirely in their hands, so presumably was the direction of religious matters exclusively their affair. There is at least no trace of any direct deliberation and determination of the whole congregation in individual cases of

language is at first sight strange, since no actual distinction is made in the Old Testament between συναγωγή and ἐκκλησία. The LXX. put συναγωγή for עֵדָה, and as a rule ἐκκλησία for קָהָל; as the Targums do כנישתא for עדה, and generally קהלא for קהל. The former is chiefly used in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers and Joshua, the latter in Deuteronomy, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah (for particulars see the Concordances), both very frequently without real difference to designate the "congregation" of Israel. Later Judaism however seems already to have made a distinction in the use of the two terms, and such an one that συναγωγή designated the congregation more on the side of its empirical reality, ἐκκλησία more on that of its ideal signification; συναγωγή being *the associated congregation as constituted in some one place; ἐκκλησία, on the other hand, the assembly of those called by God to salvation*, especially like קָהָל, the ideal church of Israel (on קָהָל, comp. in the Mishna, *Jebamoth* viii. 2; *Kiddushin* iv. 3; *Horajoth* i. 4–5; *Jadajim* iv. 4). When then Augustine says συναγωγή = *congregatio*, which is used also of animals, ἐκκλησία = *convocatio*, which is on the contrary used rather of men (see *Enarrat. in Ps.* lxxxi. 1), this much at least is true, that the latter is in fact the worthier term. Συναγωγή only expresses the empiric matter of fact, ἐκκλησία contains as well a dogmatic judgment of value. From this distinction between the terms which, as it seems, soon became a prevailing one even in Judaism, it is easily understood, that Christian usage took possession almost exclusively of the latter expression. Lastly, we have here to note in passing the expression צִבּוּר so frequently used in the Mishna. It denotes generally the Church, not as a community, but only as an aggregate in contrast to the individual, thus *e.g.* in the yet to be discussed expression שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, *Berachoth* v. 5; *Rosh hashana* iv. 9. In sacrificial language the public sacrifices, which were offered in the name of all Israel, are קרבנות צבור, *Shekalim* iv. 1, 6; *Sukka* v. 7; *Sebachim* xiv. 10; *Menachoth* ii. 2, viii. 1, ix. 6, 7, 9; *Temura* ii. 1; *Kerithoth* i. 6; *Para* ii. 1. Comp. also חטאת צבור, *Joma* vi. 1; *Sebachim* v. 3 and elsewhere; זבחי שלמי צבור, *Pesachim* vii. 4; *Sebachim* v. 5 and elsewhere. A public fast is called a fast, which was ordered, על הצבור, *Taanith* i. 5, 6, ii. 9, 10. צִבּוּר then is everywhere not the "community," but the "aggregate."

discipline and government, of the kind which we meet with in the Christian Church at Corinth. In the Jewish community, on the contrary, these were administered by means of appointed officials, *i.e.* the elders of the congregation. In particular were the latter very probably competent to exercise that most important act of religious discipline, the *infliction of excommunication or exclusion from the congregation.* The strict administration of this means of discipline was for post-exilian Judaism nothing less than a vital question. In its continual contact with its heathen neighbours, the Jewish Church could only keep itself intact by the most careful separation from itself of all foreign elements. As then the firmer organization of the post-exilian Church had begun by the proclamation, that every one who would not submit to the new order should be excluded from the congregation (Ezra x. 8), so had care to be continually exercised for the exclusion of opposing elements in the way of Church discipline. That this regulation actually existed in the time of Christ is proved by repeated allusions in the New Testament (Luke vi. 22; John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2). The only question is, whether there were various kinds of exclusion. Many scholars have, after the example of Elias Levita († 1549) in his "*Tishbi*," distinguished three different kinds: (1) נִדּוּי, (2) חֵרֶם, (3) שַׁמָּתָא. Of these however the latter forthwith falls away, נִדּוּי and שַׁמָּתָא being, as Buxtorf already showed, used in the Talmud synonymously.[49] Only the distinction between two kinds has been handed down: the נִדּוּי or temporary exclusion, and the חֵרֶם or permanent ban.[50] It is however difficult to say how old this distinction is. All that is directly testified to in the New Testament is the *ἀφορίζειν* (Luke vi. 22) or *ἀποσυνάγωγον ποιεῖν* or *γίνεσθαι* (John ix. 22, xii. 42, xvi. 2), therefore

[49] *Lex. Chald.* col. 2462–2470 (*s.v.* שמתא). Comp. also Levy, *Chald. Wörterb. s.v.* חרם.

[50] So Maimonides in Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 739.

only the custom of expulsion as such. When in the well-known passage of the First Epistle to the Corinthians the expression *παραδοῦναι τῷ Σατανᾷ* (ver. 5) also occurs beside *αἴρειν ἐκ μέσου* (ver. 2), it is just a question, whether by the former we are to understand a stricter form of excommunication. In the Mishna too expulsion is only mentioned as such and the possibility of readmission assumed.[51] On the other side, the Old Testament is already acquainted with the term חֵרֶם, *i.e.* the permanent excommunication or curse; and that it was current (in the sense of the curse) at least as a dogmatic notion to later Judaism also, is proved by the expressions *ἀνάθεμα* and *ἀναθεματίζειν* so repeatedly occurring in the New Testament (Rom. ix. 3; 1 Cor. xii. 3, xvi. 22; Gal. i. 8, 9; Mark xiv. 71; Acts xxiii. 12, xiv. 21). The actual practice of anathematizing in the synagogues is proved from the 2nd century after Christ and onwards by the statement of Justin and other Fathers, that the Jews in their daily prayer always pronounced curses upon the Christians.[51a] It is true that the infliction of the *ἀνάθεμα* upon certain individuals is not here spoken of, and it is also questionable, whether the curses were pronounced directly upon Christians. But at any rate the actual custom of anathematizing in public worship at that period is proved. It is therefore at least possible, that so early as the time of Christ, two kinds of exclusion from the congregation took place, either without or with the infliction of the *ἀνάθεμα*. Nothing more definite can be asserted in the absence of direct evidence.[52] It is

[51] *Taanith* iii. 8; *Moed katan* iii. 1–2; *Edujoth* v. 6; *Middoth* ii. 2.

[51a] Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 16. Epiphan. *haer.* xxix. 9. Further particulars in the appendix on the Shemoneh Esreh.

[52] Compare on the excommunication in general, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, col. 827–829 (*s.v.* חרם), col. 1303–1307 (*s.v.* נדוי), col. 2462–2470 (*s.v.* שמתא). Selden, *De synedriis*, lib. i. cap. viii. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 729–768. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 554–562. Bindrim, *De gradibus excommunicationis apud Hebraeos*, in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxvi. Gottl. Isr. Musculus, *De excommunicatione Hebraeorum et ejusdem in*

highly probable that only the elders of the congregation were authorized to inflict this extreme penalty. For as in post-exilian Judaism the bulk of the people as such nowhere—so far as we know—exercised jurisdiction, we must not assume it with respect to excommunication. In fact we see, *e.g.* from John ix. 22, that it was inflicted by the *Ἰουδαίοις, i.e.* in the language of this Gospel, by the authorities of the nation. And this is indirectly confirmed by the circumstance, that in the era of the Mishna, when the political organization of the nation was dissolved, and the professional scribes more and more acquired the powers of the former local authorities, it was just the "learned" (חֲכָמִים) who inflicted and abolished excommunication.[53] In the Talmudic and post-Talmudic periods also, this was in the hands of competent church authorities.[54]

Besides the elders who had the general direction of the affairs of the congregation, special officers were appointed for special purposes. But the peculiarity here is, that just for the acts proper to public worship—the reading of the Scriptures, preaching and prayer — no special officials were appointed. These acts were, on the contrary, in the time of Christ still freely performed in turn by members of the congregation, on which account *e.g.* Christ was able, whenever

*Novo Testamento vestigiis*, Lips. 1703. Danz, *Ritus excommunicationis* (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, pp. 615–648). For other and older discussions, see Meusel, *Bibliotheca historica*, i. 2. 198 sq. Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Bann." Merx in Schenkel's *Bibellex. s.v.* Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. i. *s.v.* Wiesner, *Der Bann in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Leipzig 1864.

[53] See especially *Moed katan* iii. 1–2.

[54] In Justinian's *Novell.* 146, in which the reading of the Greek text of the Scriptures is allowed in Jewish synagogues, and the Jewish authorities directed not to obstruct this by the infliction of excommunication, in respect of the latter it is said: Οὐδὲ ἄδειαν ἔξουσιν οἱ παρ' αὐτοῖς ἀρχιφερεκῖται ἢ πρεσβύτεροι τυχὸν ἢ διδάσκαλοι προσαγορευόμενοι περινοίαις τισὶν ἢ ἀναθεματισμοῖς τοῦτο κωλύειν. Maimonides assumes it as self-evident, that excommunication is inflicted by the בית דין. See on the subject in general, Vitringa, pp. 744–751.

He came into a synagogue, to immediately address the congregation (see further particulars below on the order of public worship). But though no official readers, preachers and liturgists were appointed, it was above all necessary that: (1) An official should be nominated, who should have the care of external order in public worship and the supervision of the concerns of the synagogue in general. This was the *Ruler of the synagogue.*[55] Such *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι* are met with in the entire sphere of Judaism, not only in Palestine,[56] but also in Egypt,[57] Asia Minor,[58] Greece,[59] Italy,[60] and the Roman Empire in general.[61] The office and title were also transferred from the Jews to the Judaeo-Christian churches of Palestine,[62]

[55] Comp. on the Archisynagogi my article: *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit* (Leipzig 1879), pp. 25–28. The older literature is unproductive as jumbling together so much that is heterogeneous. We bring forward Vitringa, *Archisynagogus observationibus novis illustratus*, Franeq. 1685. Idem, *De synagoga vetere*, pp. 580–592, 695–711. Rhenferd, *Investigatio praefectorum et ministrorum synagogae*, c. i. (*Opp. phil.* p. 480 sqq.; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.).

[56] Mark v. 22, 35, 36, 38; Luke viii. 49, xiii. 14. *Evang. Nicodemi* in Thilo, *Codex apocr. Nov. Test.* pp. 514 sq., 640, 645 (= *Acta Pilati* in Tischendorf, *Evang. apocr.* 1876, pp. 221, 270, 275, 284).

[57] Hadrian's letter to Servianus in Vopiscus, *Vita Saturnin.* c. viii. (*Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. Peter, 1865, ii. 209).

[58] Acts xiii. 15 (the Pisidian Antioch). Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 11 (Cilicia). The Inscription of Smyrna, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vii. No. 14, 1883, p. 161 sq.

[59] Acts xviii. 8, 17 (Corinth). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (Aegina).

[60] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9906 (Rome). Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini*, p. 67 (Rome). Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905 (Capua). Ascoli, *Iscrizioni inedite o mal note greche latine ebraiche di antichi sepolcri giudaici*, 1880, p. 49, n. 1, pp. 52, 57 (Venusia in Lower Italy). The same three inscriptions in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. (1883), n. 6201, 6205, 6232. The last two also in Lenormant, *La Catacombe juive de Venosa* in *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. No. 12 (1883), pp. 203–204. The three first named inscriptions from Rome and Capua are given also in the appendix to my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, Nos. 5, 19, 42.

[61] *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel), xvi. 8. 4, 13, 14. Comp. also Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 137.

[62] Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 18: *πρεσβυτέρους γὰρ οὗτοι ἔχουσι καὶ ἀρχισυναγώγους.*

nay it is also found occasionally in Christian churches beyond Palestine.[62a] The Hebrew title רֹאשׁ הַכְּנֶסֶת[63] is undoubtedly synonymous with it. That this office differed from that of an elder of the congregation is proved by the joint occurrence of the titles *πρεσβύτεροι* and *ἀρχισυνάγωγοι*.[64] But it is most instructive, that according to the evidence of the inscriptions one and the same person could fill the offices of both *ἄρχων* and *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*.[65] The *ἄρχοντες* were in the Dispersion the "chiefs" of the congregation, in whose hands lay the direction in general. The office therefore of the Archisynagogos was at all events distinct from theirs. Nor can he have been the chief of the archontes, who was called *γερουσιάρχης* (see below, § 31, on the Dispersion).

[62a] We have at least *one* example in North Africa. In the ruins of an ancient Basilica at Hammâm-el-Enf, in the neighbourhood of Tunis, is found an inscription, upon which, among other things, it is said: Asterius filius Rustici *acrosinagogi*, Margarita Riddei partem portici tesselavit. The monogram added, and certainly belonging to the original state of the inscription, proves the inscription to be Christian. Jewish influence is however seen in the addition of the seven-branched candlestick along with the Christian monogram. See *Ephemeris epigraphica*, vol. v. 1884, p. 537, n. 1222 (communicated by Johannes Schmidt after the *Bulletin épigraphique de la Gaule*, iii. 1883, p. 107).

[63] *Sota* vii. 7–8. At the blessing of the high priest on the day of atonement the procedure is as follows: "The minister of the synagogue (*chassan ha-keneseth*) takes a roll of the law and gives it to the archisynagogus (*rosh ha-keneseth*), he hands it to the president of the priests, and he to the high priest, who receives it standing and reads standing. . . . (8) At the reading of passages by the king on the first day of the feast of Tabernacles, the procedure is as follows: A wooden tribune (*βῆμα*) is erected for the king in the fore-court, and he takes his seat upon it. . . . The minister of the synagogue takes a roll of the law and hands it to the archisynagogus (*rosh ha-keneseth*), he hands it to the president of the priests, he to the high priest, he to the king, and the king receives it standing and reads sitting," etc. The first half of this passage is also in *Joma* vii. 1.

[64] Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 11. 18. *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. p. 13. *Acta Pilati* in Tischendorf, p. 221.

[65] Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 67, *Stafulo arconti et archisynagogo*. Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657. *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905; Alfius Juda, *arcon arcosynagogus*. Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9906: Ἰουλιανὸς *ἱερεὺς ἄρχων . . . υἱὸς* Ἰουλιανοῦ *ἀρχισυναγώγου*.

He had therefore nothing to do with the direction of the community in general. *His office was, on the contrary, that of specially caring for public worship.* He was called "archisynagogus," not as head of the community, but as conductor of their assembly for public worship. As a rule he was indeed taken out of the number of the elders of the congregation. Among his functions is specially mentioned *e.g.* that of appointing who should read the Scriptures and the prayer,[66] and summoning fit persons to preach.[67] He had to take care that nothing unfitting should take place in the synagogue (Luke xiii. 14), and had also the charge of the synagogue building.[68] There was generally but one archisynagogus for each synagogue. Sometimes however more than one are mentioned for one synagogue; so especially Acts xiii. 15 (*ἀπέστειλαν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι πρὸς αὐτούς*), while the more indefinite expression *εἷς τῶν ἀρχισυναγώγων* (Mark v. 22) may also be explained as: one of the class of the presidents of the synagogues (see Weiss on the passage). In later times the title *ἀρχισυνάγωγος* seems to have been bestowed as a mere title upon even minors and women.[68a] It is remarkable that archisynagogi occur in *heathen worship* also. It may however be here left undecided, whether the use of the expression originated in the Jewish or heathen sphere.[69]

[66] See Rashi, Bartenora and Sheringam on *Joma* vii. 1 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 244, 246). Rashi, Bartenora and Sheringam on *Sota* vii. 7 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 266, 267).

[67] In Acts xiii. 15, Paul and Barnabas are summoned by the archisynagogi, in Antioch in Pisidia, to speak, if they have a *λόγος παρακλήτεως*.

[68] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894. The archisynagogus in Aegina directs the building of a synagogue (*ἐκ θεμελίων τὴν συναγ[ωγὴν] οἰκοδόμησα*).

[68a] *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6201 (= Ascoli, *Iscrizioni*, p. 49, note 1): *Καλλιστου νιπιου αρχοσσιναγωγου ετων γ μηνων γ.* *Revue des études juives*, vol. vii. No. 14, p. 161 sq.: *Ρουφεινα Ιουδαια αρχισυναγωγος.*

[69] Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vii. 10. 4, mentions an *ἀρχισυνάγωγος τῶν ἀπ' Αἰγύπτου μάγων*. Upon an inscription in Olynth (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 994, Addend. n. 2007[b]) occurs an *Αἰλιανὸς Νείκων ὁ ἀρχισυνάγωγος θεοῦ ἥρωος καὶ τὸ κολλήγιον Βειβίῳ Ἀντωνίῳ ἀνέστησεν τὸν βωμόν*. Upon an

Besides the ruler of the synagogue, we meet with as officers of the congregation (2) the *receivers* of alms גַּבָּאֵי צְדָקָה.[70] They had certainly nothing to do with public worship as such, and are therefore, where the civil and the religious communities were not separated, to be regarded rather as civil officials. They must however be named here, because it was in the synagogues that the collection of alms took place.[71] According to the Mishna the collection was to be made by at least two, the distribution by three persons.[72] Not only was money collected (in the box, קוּפָּה), but also natural products (in the dish, תַּמְחוּי).[73] Lastly we have to name the minister, Hebr. חַזָּן הַכְּנֶסֶת;[74] Greek ὑπηρέτης.[75]

inscription in Chios (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1031, Addend. 2221c) five [ἀρχισυ]νάγωγοι οἱ ἄρξαντες. A jumble of religions being the order of the day in Egypt, and the two Greek inscriptions very recent, a borrowing from Judaism is very possible in all three cases. When lastly Alexander Severus was derisively called a *Syrus archisynagogus* (*Lamprid. Vita Alex. Sev.* c. 28, in *Script. Hist. Aug.* ed. Peter, i. 247), it is uncertain, whether we have to think of a heathen or Jewish archisynagogus.

[70] *Demai* iii. 1; *Kiddushin* iv. 5. In the latter passage it is said, that the posterity of the נבאי צדקה are without special investigation accounted Israelites of pure blood, with whom members of the priestly class may intermarry. It is thus seen that they were really officials.

[71] Matt. vi. 2, and Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.*) thereon and Wetzstein (*Nov. Test.*); also Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 211 sq.

[72] *Peah* viii. 7.

[73] *Peah* viii. 7; *Pesachim* x. 1. For more exact information concerning the functions of the almoners in Talmudic and post-Talmudic Judaism, see Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 375 (*s.v.* נבאי), 2095 (*s.v.* קופה), 2604 (*s.v.* תמחוי). Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr. ad Matt.* vi. 2. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 544. Rhenford, *De decem otiosis*, Diss. i. c. 78–88. Werner, *De fisco et paropside pauperum*, Jenae 1725 (cited by Winer, *RWB.* i. 46).

[74] *Sota* viii. 7–8; *Joma* vii. 1; *Makkoth* iii. 12; *Shabbath* i. 3 (in the latter passage only חזן). Tosefta, ed. Zuckermandel, p. 198, 23. 199. 8, 216. 7. Aramaic חזנא, *Sota* ix. 15. Comp. Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 11: Ἀζανιτῶν τῶν παρ' αὐτοῖς διακόνων ἑρμηνευομένων ἢ ὑπηρετῶν. The title is also found in mediaeval Hebrew epitaphs, *e.g.* in Paris (Longpérier, *Journal des Savants*, 1874, p. 668, n. 42). חזנים also occur in the temple, *Sukka* iv. 4; *Tamid* v. 3.

[75] Luke iv. 20. Such a minister of the synagogue is certainly also meant in the Roman-Judaic epitaph: Φλαβιος Ἰουλιανος ὑπηρετης. Φλαβια

His office was to bring forth the Holy Scriptures at public worship and to put them by again.[76] He was in every respect the servant of the congregation, having *e.g.* to execute upon those condemned to it the punishment of scourging,[77] and also to instruct children in reading.[78] The שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, who had to pronounce the prayer at public worship in the name of the congregation, is also generally regarded as one of its officers.[79] In truth however the prayer was not said by a permanent officer, but by any member of the congregation (see below on Public Worship). Hence whoever said the prayer in the name of the congregation was always called שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר, "plenipotentiary of the congregation." And the "ten unemployed men" (עֲשָׂרָה בַּטְלָנִין, *decem otiosi*), whose business it was, especially in the post-Talmudic period, to be always present for a fee in the synagogue at public worship, for the purpose of making up the number of ten members required for a religious assembly, are still less than the Sheliach-Zibbur to be regarded as officials.[80] Besides, the

Ἰουλιανη θυγατηρ πατρι. Εν ειρηνη ἡ κοιμησις σου (Garrucci, *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento*, vol. ii. 1865, p. 166, n. 22; also in my *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, Appendix, No. 30).

[76] *Sota* vii. 7–8; *Joma* vii. 1; Luke iv. 20. The commentaries on Sota and Joma (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 266 sq., ii. 246).

[77] *Makkoth* iii. 12. [78] *Shabbath* i. 3.

[79] *Berachoth* v. 5; *Rosh hashana* iv. 9.

[80] Buxtorf, *Lex Chald.* col. 292 (*s.v.* בטלן): Apud Rabbinos de decem בטלנין crebra fit mentio. Sunt autem decem viri otiosi, Synagogae Judaicae quasi Stipendiarii, qui stipendium accipiunt, ut in precibus et aliis conventibus sacris, in Synagoga semper frequentes adsint et ab initio ad finem cum sacerdote aut sacrorum praefecto perdurent, ne synagoga unquam in sacris sit vacua aut sacerdos solus. This precise explanation of Buxtorf is confirmed by Rabbinical authorities, *e.g.* Rashi on *Baba kamma* 82a (in Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 532), Bartenora on *Megilla* i. 3 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 388 sq.). In the Talmud the עשרה בטלנין are not often mentioned, *Jer. Megilla* i. 6 (70b below), *Bab Megilla* 5a, *Baba kamma* 82a, *Sanhedrin* 17b (in Vitringa, *De decemviris otios*, c. 2; *De synag.* p. 531); as it is in none of these passages exactly stated what was the case with these men, Lightfoot was able to set up the mistaken hypothesis (*Horae Hebr. ad Matt.* iv. 23), that the *decem otiosi* were officials of the

arrangement was still quite unknown in the time of the Mishna. The expression itself occurs indeed in the Mishna,[81] but it can originally have designated none else than such persons as were not prevented by business from visiting the synagogue even on week days. For on the Sabbath every Israelite was unemployed, and therefore *otiosum esse* would be no specific mark of individuals. That such is the meaning also in this passage of the Mishna is quite clear from the context. Hence the usual Sabbath day worship is not even thought of in it; and still less is it said, that in *every* congregation ten unemployed men must be present. On the contrary, it is only stated, as a mark of a large town, that even on week days there was always without difficulty a sufficient number of synagogue frequenters present. It was not till considerably later, that the above-named arrangement was made, and an altered meaning thus given to the term.

The *building*, in which the congregation assembled for public worship, was called בֵּית הַכְּנֶסֶת,[82] Aramaic בֵּי כְנִישְׁתָּא or merely כְּנִישְׁתָּא,[83] Greek *συναγωγή*[84] or *προσ-*

synagogue, thus making the whole number of synagogue officials to consist of these ten men. This mistake called forth a learned controversy, in which Rhenford unsparingly, and Vitringa more gently, attacked Lightfoot's opinion. See especially, Rhenford, *De decem otiosis synagogae*, Francquerae 1686. Vitringa, *Decemviris otiosis*, Franequerae 1687 (both also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.). Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 530–549. A short statement of the whole controversy will be found in Carpzov's *Apparatus historico-crit.* pp. 310–312.

[81] *Megilla* i. 3: "What is a large town? One in which are *ten unemployed men*. If there are fewer, it is a village."

[82] In the Mishna in the following places: *Berachoth* vii. 3; **Terumoth* xi. 10; *Bikkurim* i. 4; *Erubim* x. 10; **Pesachim* iv. 4; *Sukka* iii. 13; *Rosh hashana* iii. 7; *Megilla* iii. 1–3; *Nedarim* v. 5, ix. 2; *Shebuoth* iv. 10; **Aboth* iii. 10; *Negaim* xiii. 12. In the passages marked * the plural form בתי כנסיות occurs.

[83] See Levy, *Chald. WB. s.v.* Idem, *Neuhebr. WB. s.v.*

[84] Frequently in the New Testament. In Josephus only three times, *Antt.* xix. 6. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4–5, vii. 3. 3. In Philo, *Quod omnis probis liber*, § 12, ed. Mang. ii. 458 (on the Essenes): *εἰς ἱεροὺς ἀφικνούμενοι*

εὐχή.[85] The designations συναγώγιον,[86] προσευκτήριον[87] and σαββατεῖον[88] appear in single instances. Synagogues were built by preference outside the towns and near rivers, or on the seashore for the sake of giving every one a convenient opportunity for performing such Levitical purification as might be necessary

τόπους, οἳ καλοῦνται συναγωγαί. Frequently also in the later literature, *e.g. Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8, *passim*. Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (Aegina). The use of the term συναγωγή to designate a Christian place of worship can as yet be only *twice* pointed out, one strange to say among the anti-Judaistic Marcionites in an inscription of A.D. 319 at Deir-Ali, about three miles south of Damascus: συναγωγὴ Μαρκιωνιστῶν κώμ(ης) Λεβάβων (Le Bas et Waddington, *Inscriptions grecques et latines*, vol. iii. n. 2558. Comp. also Harnack, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaft. Theol.* 1876, p. 103). The other example is the inscription of Hammâm el-Enf (already mentioned, note 62[a]), which begins: Sancta synagoga Naron pro salutem suam ancilla tua Julia Gnar de suo proprio tesselavit (read: Sanctam synagogam Naron[itanam] pro salute sua ancilla tua Julia Nar[onitana] de suo proprio tesselavit).

[85] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 6, 7, 14 (Mang. ii. 523, 524, 535). *Legat. ad Caj.* § 20, 23, 43, 46 (Mang. ii. 565, 568, 596, 600). Acts xvi. 13: ἔξω τῆς πύλης παρὰ ποταμὸν οὗ ἐνομίζομεν προσευχὴν εἶναι. Joseph. *Vita*, c. 54: συνάγονται πάντες εἰς τὴν προσευχήν, μέγιστον οἴκημα πολὺν ὄχλον ἐπιδέξασθαι δυνάμενον. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. Addend. n. 2114b, 2114[bb] (Inscriptions of Pantikapaion on the Cimmerian Bosphorus). Juvenal, *Sat.* iii. 296: Ede, ubi consistas, in qua te quaero proseucha? Gruter, *Corp. Inscr.* p. 651, n. 11: Dis M. P. Corfidio Signino pomario de aggere a proseucha, etc. (Corfidius of Signia, fruit seller at the wall near the proseuche.) Comp. 3 Macc. vii. 20: τόπον προσευχῆς. The word occurs *also in heathen worship* as the designation of a place of prayer. See *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 2079 (Inscription of Olbia on the Pontus Euxinus). Epiphan. *haer.* lxxx. 1, on the heathen Massalians (see the words farther on). Also in Gruter, *Inscr.*, it is surely rather a heathen proseuche that is meant.

[86] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (Mang. ii. 591). Idem, *De somniis*, ii. 18 (Mang. i. 675). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9908: πατηρ συναγωγιων.

[87] Philo, *Vita Mosis*, iii. 27 (Mang. ii. 168).

[88] Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2 (in an edict of Augustus). The learned Hug thought that a "Sabbath house" was also mentioned upon a Greek inscription at Thyatira (*Einl. in das N. T.* 4th ed. ii. § 89, p. 290). See *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 3509: Φάβιος Ζώσιμος κατασκευάσας σορὸν ἔθετο ἐπὶ τόπου καθαροῦ, ὄντος πρὸ τῆς πόλεως πρὸς τῷ Σαμβαθείῳ ἐν τῷ Χαλδαίου περιβόλῳ κ.τ.λ. This Σαμβαθεῖον however is a sanctuary of the Chaldean or Persian sibyl, whose name was according to Suidas properly Σαμβήθη. See Stephanus, *Thes. s.v.* Σαμβήθη.

before attending public worship.[88a] The size and architecture were of course very various.[89] In northern Galilee ruins of ancient synagogues are preserved to the present time, the oldest of which are of the second, nay possibly of the first century after Christ. They may perhaps give an idea of the style of building employed for synagogues in the time of Christ.[89a] The large synagogue at Alexandria is said to have

[88a] See especially Acts xvi. 13. Deutsch, *Sacra Judaeorum ad littora frequenter exstructa*, Lips. 1713. Comp. also note 92, below. There is not indeed a trace of this in Rabbinical literature, but on the contrary the injunction is to build the synagogues *upon the highest point in the town* (Tosefta, *Megilla* iv. p. 277, lin. 16 sq., ed. Zuckermandel). For this reason the fact asserted by us has been quite disputed by Löw (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, pp. 167–170). But this theoretic injunction is no proof that the custom existed (comp. note 117, below). Löw even points out, that synagogues were frequently built *outside the towns* (pp. 109 sqq., 161 sqq.). That in doing this the neighbourhood of water should be sought, where it was to be had, is at least very probable. Comp. Aristeas (ed. Mor. Schmidt, p. 67) on the seventy interpreters: *ὡς δ' ἔθος ἐστὶ πᾶσι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἀπονιψάμενοι τῇ θαλάσσῃ τὰς χεῖρας, ὡς ἂν εὔξωνται πρὸς τὸν θεόν.* Judith xii. 7. Clemens, *Alex. Strom.* iv. 22. 142. It is not said, that the hands must *always* be washed or bathed before prayer, but that one or the other must be done in proportion to the degree of Levitical uncleanness which may exist. Cautious persons may have preferred to do too much, rather than too little in this respect. See in general, Vitringa, *De synag.* pp. 1091, 1105 sq. It is well known, that the custom of washing the hands and of other lustrations was practised also in heathenism (*Odyss.* ii. 261, iv. 750 sqq.; *Ilias*, vi. 266 sq. Potter, *Archaeolog. graec.* ii. 4), and in the Christian church (see Tertullian, *De oratione*, c. 13: Ceterum quae ratio est, manibus quidem *ablutis*, spiritu vero sordente orationem obire. Passages from Chrysostom in Suicerus, *Sacrorum observationum*, lib. sing. p. 153). See in general, Pfannenschmidt, *Das Weihwasser im heidnischen und christlichen Cultus*, 1869.

[89] See in general, Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissenschaft des Judenth.* 1884, p. 214 sqq.

[89a] The importance and great antiquity of these ruins was already rightly recognised by Robinson (*Recent Biblical Researches*, vol. iii. pp. 70, 71, 74, 342, 346, 367, 368 sq.). They were afterwards thoroughly treated of especially by Renan (*Mission de Phénicie*, pp. 761–783). For delineations, see *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs* by Conder and Kitchener, vol. i. pp. 231, 232, 252, 397–399, 401. Comp. also the articles of Wilson and Kitchener in the *Quarterly Statement*, 1869 and 1878, printed in the *Survey*, etc. *Special Papers*, pp. 294–305. Also Baedeker-Socin, *Palästina*, pp. 387, 390,

had the form of a Basilica.[90] It is possible, that they were sometimes built like theatres, without a roof, but this is only really testified concerning those of the Samaritans.[91] It is certainly true, that on their fast days the Jews did not offer

391, 393, 394, 397. Ebers and Guthe, *Palästina*, i. 342–345, 502. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 198–201, 227–231, 241 sq., ii. 95, 100 sq., 357 sq., 429 sq., 441, 447–449. On the ruins of Tell Hum specially, *The Recovery of Jerusalem*, by Wilson, Warren, etc. (1871), pp. 342–346. The ruins discovered are: *Kasiun*, *Kefr Birim*, *el-Djisch*, *Meiron*, *Nabartein*, *Kedes* (?), *Tell Hum*, *Keraze*, *Irbid*. The five first lie west and south-west of Lake Merom, Kedes north-west (the meaning of the ruins there is however doubtful), Tell Hum and Keraze on the Lake of Gennesareth, Irbid north-west of Tiberias. In Kefr Birim, el-Djisch, Meiron and Irbid ruins are already spoken of by Jewish pilgrims of the Middle Ages, who for the most part attribute their building to Simon ben Jochai (second century after Christ); the synagogue at Irbid is even referred to the much more ancient Nittai of Arbela. See Carmoly, *Itinéraires de la Terre Sainte des* xiii^e^, xiv^e^, xv^e^, xvi^e^, *et* xvii^e^ *siècle, traduits de l'hebreu* (Bruxelles 1847), pp. 132, 136, 380 (Kefr Birim), pp. 262, 452 sq. (Gush Caleb=el-Djisch), pp. 133 sq., 184, 260 (Meiron), pp. 131, 259 (Arbel=Irbid). The date of the synagogue at Kasiun is decided by a Greek inscription of the time of Septimus Severus (A.D. 197) found among the ruins (Renan, p. 774). The style of the other synagogues being more or less akin to this, it is very probable, that they all belong to the flourishing period of Rabbinical Judaism in Galilee, *i.e.* to the second, third and fourth centuries after Christ. Renan tries to refer some even to the first century, especially the very well preserved one in Kefr Birim (p. 773). Pious imagination may therefore indulge in the thought, that the ruins at Tell Hum (=Capernaum) may possibly be those of the synagogue built by the Roman centurion, in which Jesus often taught (Wilson in *The Recovery*, p. 345. Guérin, *Galilée*, i. 229 sq. Bädcker, 390). Almost all these synagogues lie north and south, so that the entrance is at the south. As a rule they appear to have had three doors in the front, one chief entrance and two smaller side doors (so in Kefr Birim, Meiron, Tell Hum). In some it is still discernible, that they were divided by two rows of columns into three aisles (as in Nabartein and Kasiun); the synagogue at Tell Hum had even five aisles. Some had a portico in front (as in Kefr Birim and Meiron). In general the architecture was influenced by the Graeco-Roman, while it yet very characteristically differed from it. It was especially distinguished by rich and superfluous ornamentation.

[90] *Jer. Sukka* v. 1, fol. 55ab; the same passage is also in Tosefta, *Sukka* 198, 20 sqq., ed. Zuckermandel. Philo too mentions among the proseuchae of Alexandria a *μεγίστη καὶ περισημοτάτη* (*Leg. ad Caj.* § 20, Mang. ii. 565).

[91] Epiph. *haer.* lxxx. 1.

their public prayers in the synagogue, but in an open space, perhaps also at the sea-shore.[92] But this was done in quite open spaces, and does not prove the existence of unroofed buildings. Still more improbable is it, that just such buildings were called *προσευχαί* in a narrower sense, in distinction from the synagogues proper (as was after the precedent of others, admitted in the 1st edition of this work). For the testimony of Epiphanius, the supposed chief authority, by no means proves this.[93] The Acts of the Apostles seems rather to speak for a distinction between the terms *προσευχή* and

[92] *Taanith* ii. 1: How is the *order of the fast day solemnity?* The ark (in which are the rolls of the law) is brought *to the open space of the town*, ashes of burnt wood are spread upon the ark and upon the heads of the prince and the chief of the court of justice, and every one else puts ashes on his own head. The eldest among those present, etc. . . (here follow further liturgical directions). Tertullian, *De jejunio*, c. 16: Judaicum certe jejunium ubique celebratur, cum omissis templis per omne litus quocunque in aperto aliquando jam precem ad caelum mittunt. Id. *Ad nationes*, i. 13: Judaici ritus luceanarum et jejunia cum azymis et orationes litorales. Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 23: *καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος.* Comp. also Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 14, Mang. ii. 535. Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 166 sq.

[93] Epiphan. *haer.* lxxxi. (on the Messalians): *Τινὰς δὲ οἴκους ἑαυτοῖς κατασκευάσαντες ἢ τόπους πλατεῖς, φόρων δίκην, προσευχὰς ταύτας ἐκάλουν. Καὶ ἦσαν μὲν τὸ παλαιὸν προσευχῶν τόποι ἔν τε τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἔξω πόλεως καὶ ἐν τοῖς Σαμαρείταις, ὡς καὶ ἐν ταῖς Πράξεσι τῶν ἀποστόλων ηὕρομεν* (here follows the quotation Acts xvi. 13). *Ἀλλὰ καὶ προσευχῆς τόπος ἐν Σικίμοις, ἐν τῇ νυνὶ καλουμένῃ Νεαπόλει ἔξω τῆς πόλεως, ἐν τῇ πεδιάδι, ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων δύο, θεατροειδής, οὕτως ἐν ἀέρι καὶ αἰθρίῳ τόπῳ ἐστὶ κατασκευασθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν Σαμαρειτῶν πάντα τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μιμουμένων.* In explanation we remark (1) that what Epiphanius says of the *heathen* Messalians is of course not the rule for Jewish proceedings. And yet even they used the designation *προσευχή* for both kinds of places of prayer, the *οἶκοι* and the *τόποι πλατεῖς*. (2) Epiphanius certainly means to say by the learned remark which follows, that there were also among the Jews and Samaritans places of prayer under the open sky, called *προσευχαί*. He has however independent knowledge of this fact only among the Samaritans. With respect to the Jews he knows nothing more of it (comp. the praeterite *ἦσαν τὸ παλαιόν*), and only rests his assertion on Acts xvi. 13. And supposing he was in the right, this would *not* prove, that these places of prayer were called proseuchae in distinction from the synagogues.

*συναγωγή*, since here, chap. xvi. 13, 16, a *προσευχή* is spoken of at Philippi, and then directly after, chap. xvii. 1, a *συναγωγή* at Thessalonica. If however any distinction at all is to exist, it can only be, that the *προσευχή* was intended solely for prayer, the *συναγωγή* for other acts of worship also. But even this distinction is untenable in Acts xvi. 13, 16, since here the *προσευχή* is evidently the usual place of the Sabbath assembly, in which Paul also embraces the opportunity of preaching. And since, on the other hand, Philo in particular uses the word of the synagogue proper, no material distinction can be established between the two expressions.[94]

Considering the value laid on these Sabbath assemblies, we must assume that there was in every town of Palestine, and even in smaller places, at least *one* synagogue.[95] In the post-Talmudic period it was required, that a synagogue should be built wherever but ten Israelites were dwelling together.[96] In the pre-Talmudic age indeed this requirement cannot be literally shown to have existed, though quite in agreement with its spirit. In the larger towns there was a considerable number of synagogues, as *e.g.* in Jerusalem,[97] Alex-

[94] Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-crit.* p. 320 (where too see other authorities for and against), also declares for the identity of the two.

[95] We find synagogues *e.g.* in Nazareth (Matt. xiii. 54; Mark vi. 2; Luke iv. 16), Capernaum (Mark i. 21; Luke vii. 5; John vi. 59). Comp. Acts xv. 21: *κατὰ πόλιν*. Philo, *De Septenario*, c. 6 (Mang. ii. 282 = Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23): *Ἀναπέπταται γοῦν ταῖς ἑβδόμαις μυρία κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν.*

[96] Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 1. See Vitringa, *De Synagoga*, pp. 232–239. That at least ten persons form an assembly for public worship is already said in the Mishna. See *Megilla* iv. 3; *Sanhedrin* i. 6. Comp. also *Megilla* i. 3. With respect to the Passover, Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9, 3.

[97] Acts vi. 9, xxiv. 12. A synagogue of Alexandrines in Jerusalem, also in Tosefta, *Megilla* iii., ed. Zuckermandel, p. 224. 16; *Jer. Megilla* 73[d] (in Lightfoot, *Horae* on Acts vi. 9). The Talmudic myth, that there were 480 synagogues in Jerusalem, is indeed simply characteristic of the insipidity of these legends.

andria,[98] Rome.[99] The different synagogues of one and the same town seem to have been sometimes distinguished from each other by special emblems. Thus there was in Sepphoris a "synagogue of the vine" (כנישתא דגופנא),[100] in Rome a synagogue of the olive tree (*συναγωγὴ ἐλαίας*).[101]

The fittings of the synagogues were in New Testament times very simple. The chief was the *closet* (תֵּיבָה) in which were kept the rolls of the law and the other sacred books.[102] These were wrapped in linen cloths (מִטְפָּחוֹת),[103] and lay in a case (תִּיק = *θήκη*).[104] An elevated place (בימה =

[98] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* c. 20 (Mang. ii. 565): *πολλαὶ δέ εἰσι καθ' ἕκαστον τμῆμα τῆς πόλεως.*

[99] Philo, *Leg. ad Caj.* c. 23 (Mang. ii. 568), speaks of *προσευχαί* in Rome in the plural. For farther particulars concerning the Roman synagogues, see below, § 31.

[100] *Jer. Nasir* vii. 1, fol. 56[a]. Lightfoot mistakenly translates "synagogue of the Gophnites" (*Horae Hebr., Centuria Matthaeo praemissa*, c. 55; *Opp.* ii. 211).

[101] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9904. De Rossi, *Bulletino*, v. 1867, p. 16. I formerly felt great hesitation as to the meaning of the expression (see my *Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom*, p. 17), but now consider the above explanation undoubtedly correct.

[102] The תֵּיבָה is mentioned: *Megilla* iii. 1; *Nedarim* v. 5; *Taanith* ii. 1–2 (according to the latter passage it was transportable); also in the frequently recurring formula, עבר לפני התיבה (see below on Public Worship). Chrysost. *Orat. adv. Judaeos*, vi. 7 (*Opp.* ed. Montf. vol. i.): *Ἄλλως δὲ, ποία κιβωτὸς νῦν παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις, ὅπου ἱλαστήριον οὐκ ἔστιν; ὅπου οὐ χρησμὸς, οὐ διαθήκης πλάκες . . . Ἐμοὶ τῶν ὑπὸ τῆς ἀγορᾶς πωλουμένων κιβωτίων οὐδὲν ἄμεινον αὕτη ἡ κιβωτὸς διακεῖσθαι δοκεῖ, ἀλλὰ καὶ πολλῷ χεῖρον.* See on the whole subject, Vitringa, pp. 174–182. On the keeping of the sacred books in the synagogue, see Josephus, *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2. Chrysost. *Orat. adv. Judaeos*, i. 5: *Ἐπειδὴ δὲ εἰσί τινες, οἳ καὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν σημεῖον εἶναι τόπον νομίζουσιν, ἀναγκαῖον καὶ πρὸς τούτους ὀλίγα εἰπεῖν . . . Ὁ νόμος ἀπόκειται, φησὶν, ἐν αὐτῷ καὶ βιβλία προφητικά. Καὶ τί τοῦτο; Μὴ γάο, ἔνθα ἂν ᾖ βιβλία τοιαῦτα, καὶ ὁ τόπος ἅγιος ἔσται; Οὐ πάντως.* Similarly *Orat.* vi. 6 and 7. Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 3, in Vitringa, p. 182, and Bartenora on *Taanith* ii. 1 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 361), expressly say, that the sacred books were kept in the תיבה.

[103] *Kilajim* ix. 3; *Shabbath* ix. 6; *Megilla* iii. 1; *Kelim* xxviii. 4; *Negaim* xi. 11.

[104] *Shabbath* xvi. 1. The word תיק is also in *Kelim* xvi. 7–8. On the

*βῆμα*, tribune), upon which stood the reading-desk, was erected, at least in post-Talmudic times, for him who read the Scriptures aloud or preached.[105] Both are mentioned in the Jerusalem Talmud,[106] and may well be assumed for the time of Christ. Among other fittings, lamps may also be mentioned.[107] Lastly trombones (שׁוֹפָרוֹת) and trumpets (חֲצוֹצְרוֹת) were indispensable instruments in public worship. The former were blown especially on the first day of the year, the latter on the feast days.[108]

The *order of divine worship* was in New Testament times already tolerably developed and established. The congregation sat in an appointed order, the most distinguished members in the front seats, the younger behind; men and women probably apart.[109] In the great synagogue at Alexandria the

use of book-cases in classical antiquity, see Birt, *Das antike Buchwesen* (1882), pp. 64–66. Many expositors insist on understanding the *φελόνης* of 2 T.m. iv. 13 as such a book-case. A representation of an old silver case for the Pentateuch among the modern Samaritans is given in *The Survey of Western Palestine*, etc., vol. ii. 1882, p. 206.

[105] Maimonides, *Hilchoth Tephilla* xi. 3; Vitringa, pp. 182–190.

[106] *Jer. Megilla* iii. 1, fol. 73d, below. The reading-desk is here called אנלין = *ἀναλογεῖον*. For so must we read with *Aruch*, instead of אננלין, as given in the editions. The same word also in *Kelim* xvi. 7, 8. See Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.*

[107] *Terumoth* xi. 10; *Pesachim* iv. 4; Vitringa, pp. 194–199.

[108] *Rosh hashana* iii. 3, 4, 7, and generally iii.–iv.; *Taanith* ii.–iii. Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 341. Vitringa, pp. 203–211 (and at p. 209, also many passages from Chrysostom). Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Musikalische Instrumente." Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, pp. 513, 1469. Leyrer, art. "Musik," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* According to *Jer. Shabbath* xvii. fol. 16, *Bab. Shabbath* 35$^{b}$, the dawn of the Sabbath was also announced by the blowing of instruments (see the passages in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* חצוצרת; Vitringa, p. 1123 sq.). Whether this was general in former times (for which *Chullin* i. *fin.* speaks), or only took place in the temple at Jerusalem (which is at all events evidenced by Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 12; *Sukka* v. 5), must here be left undecided.

[109] On the *πρωτοκαθεδρία* of the scribes and Pharisees, see Matt. xxiii. 6; Mark xii. 39; Luke xi. 43, xx. 46. Philo says at least of the Essenes, that the order was according to age, the younger sitting "below" (*i.e.* behind) the elder, *Quod omnis probus liber*, c. 12 (Mang. ii. 458): *κατ' ἡλικίας; ἐν*

men are said to have sat apart according to their respective trades (אוּמָנוּת).[110] If there was a leper in the community a special division was prepared for him. So at least the Mishna required.[111] Ten individuals were necessary to form a regular assembly for public worship (see above, vol. ii. p. 67). The chief parts of the service were, according to the Mishna, the recitation of the *Shema, prayer, the reading of the Thorah, the reading of the prophets, the blessing of the priest.*[112] To these were added the *translation* of the portions of Scripture read, which is assumed in the Mishna (see below), and the explanation of what had been read by an edifying *discourse*, which in Philo figures as the chief matter in the whole service.[113]

*τάξεσιν ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέροις νέοι καθέζοντι.* The separation of the sexes must be assumed as self-evident, although it does not happen to be mentioned in any of the more ancient authorities. For what is said in Pseudo-Philo, *De vita contemplativa*, c. 9, init. (Mang. ii. 482), of the Therapeutae cannot be here taken into account. Nor is a special division for women mentioned in the Talmud; see Löw, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 364 sqq., especially 371.

[110] *Jer. Sukka* v. 1, fol. 55ab. [111] *Negaim* xiii. 12.

[112] The enumeration of these parts, *Megilla* iv. 3.

[113] We have three summary descriptions of the public worship of the synagogue in Philo: 1. *Fragm. apud Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 12–13, ed. Gaisf. (Mang. ii. 630), from the first book of the *Hypothetica*: *Τί οὖν ἐποίησε* [*scil. ὁ νομοθέτης*] *ταῖς ἑβδόμαις ταύταις ἡμέραις; Αὐτοὺς εἰς ταυτὸν ἠξίου συνάγεσθαι, καὶ καθεζομένους μετ' ἀλλήλων σὺν αἰδοῖ καὶ κόσμῳ τῶν νόμων ἀκροᾶσθαι τοῦ μηδένα ἀγνοῆσαι χάριν. Καὶ δὴτα συνέρχονται μὲν ἀεί, καὶ συνεδρεύουσι μετ' ἀλλήλων· οἱ μὲν πολλοὶ σιωπῇ, πλὴν εἴ τι προσεπιφημίσαι τοῖς ἀναγινωσκομένοις νομίζεται· τῶν ἱερέων δέ τις ὁ παρὼν ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἷς ἀναγινώσκει τοὺς ἱεροὺς νόμους αὐτοῖς, καὶ καθ' ἕκαστον ἐξηγεῖται μέχρι σχεδὸν δείλης ὀψίας.* 2. *De Septenario*, c. 6 (Mang. ii. 282 = Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23): *Ἀνατέτραται γοῦν ταῖς ἑβδόμαις μυρία κατὰ πᾶσαν πόλιν διδασκαλεῖα φρονήσεως καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ἀνδρείας καὶ δικαιοσύνης καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀρετῶν. Ἐν οἷς οἱ μὲν ἐν κόσμῳ καθέζονται, σὺν ἡσυχίᾳ τὰ ὦτα ἀνωρθωκότες, μετὰ προσοχῆς πάσης, ἕνεκα τοῦ δι' ἧς λόγων ποτίμων. Ἀναστὰς δέ τις τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων ὑφηγεῖται τἄριστα καὶ συνοίσοντα, οἷς ἅπας ὁ βίος ἐπιδώσει πρὸς τὸ βέλτιον.* 3. Of the Essenes, *Quod omnis probus liber*, c. 12 (Mang. ii. 458, also in Euseb. *Praep. Evang.* viii. 12. 10, ed. Gaisf.): *Ὁ μὲν τὰς βίβλους ἀναγινώσκει λαβών, ἕτερος δὲ τῶν ἐμπειροτάτων, ὅσα μὴ γνώριμα*

The Shema, so called from its commencing words, שְׁמַע יִשְׂרָאֵל, consists of the sections Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21, Num. xv. 37–41, together with certain benedictions before and after (see particulars in Appendix). It was always distinguished from prayer proper, and is rather a *confession of faith* than a prayer. Hence the "reciting" not the "praying" of the Shema is spoken of (קריאת שמע). As the Shema undoubtedly belongs to the times of Christ, it is evident that certain established prayers were then already customary in public worship. It can however hardly be ascertained, how much of the somewhat copiously developed liturgy of post-Talmudic Judaism reaches back to that period.[114] The formula by which the reader summoned to prayer, בָּרְכוּ אֶת יהוה, is expressly mentioned in the Mishna.[115] The custom too of praying the three first and three last benedictions of the Shemoneh Esreh (of which particulars are given in the Appendix) at Sabbath and festival worship, reaches back to the age of the Mishna.[116] It was the custom to pray stand-

παρελθὼν ἀναδιδάσκει. I here further mention, that in the post-Talmudic period, especially in the treatise *Soferim*, c. 10–21 (best edition: *Masechet Soferim*, edited by Joel Müller, 1878), there is a series of detailed directions for the synagogue worship. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 946–1121, following Maimonides, gives an exhaustive description of the ritual of the post-Talmudic period; comp. also pp. 667–711. The works of Jewish scholars, of which 100 are recorded by Strack in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xv., and chiefly among these Zunz, *Die ritus des synagogalen Gottesdienstes entwickelt*, Berlin 1859, may also be consulted for the history of the synagogue ritual in the post-Talmudic period.

[114] For a description of it, according to Maimonides, see Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1075–1090, in general, pp. 1022–1113. Every orthodox Jewish prayer-book also gives information on the subject. On the details, see especially in Hamburger's *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii., the articles "Abendgebet," "Kaddisch," "Keduscha," "Kiddusch," "Minchagebet," "Morgengebet," "Mussafgebet," "Schema," "Schemone-Esre." The so-called Kaddisch is especially interesting on account of its points of contact with the Lord's Prayer. See Hamburger as above, ii. p. 603 sqq.

[115] *Berachoth* vii. 3.

[116] Comp. on the general subject, Vitringa, p. 1024 sq. (after Maimo-

ing and with the face turned towards the Holy of Holies, *i.e.* towards Jerusalem.[117] The prayer was not uttered by the whole congregation, but by some one called upon for this office (the שְׁלִיחַ צִבּוּר) by the ruler of the synagogue, the congregation making only certain responses, especially the אָמֵן.[118] He who pronounced the prayer stepped in front of the chest in which lay the rolls of the law. Hence עָבַר לִפְנֵי הַתֵּיבָה

nides). Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 367. That the custom reaches back to the period of the Mishna is evident from *Rosh hashana* iv. 5.

[117] On standing at prayer, see Matt. vi. 5; Mark xi. 25; Luke xviii. 11; *Berachoth* v. 1; *Taanith* ii. 2. Lightfoot (*Horae Hebr.*) and Wetzstein (*Nov Test.*) on Matt. vi. 5. On turning towards the Holy of Holies, viz. towards Jerusalem, Ezek. viii. 16; 1 Kings viii. 48; Dan. vi. 11; *Berachoth* iv. 5–6; *Sifre* 71$^{b}$, ed. Friedmann in Weber, *System der altsynag. Theol.* p. 62. The same passage also in Tosefta, *Berachoth* iii. p. 8, ed. Zuckermandel (comp. also Löw, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 310). It is striking that the still remaining ruins of ancient synagogues in Galilee have almost all the entrance towards the south (see above, note 89$^{a}$). According to this it would be supposed that the Holy Land lay to the north, and that the congregation sat or stood facing the north. Or was it that the turning towards Jerusalem, *i.e.* towards the south, was required from the reader only? In after times, when the synagogues were regarded as an exchange for the temple, we meet with the direction to have the entrance as in the temple at the east (Tosefta, *Megilla* iv. p. 227, 15th ed. Zuckermandel). It seems, however, that this direction was never complied with. In the European congregations of the Middle Ages, it was the rule to place the entrance at the west, so that the worshippers might turn to the east. For further particulars, see Löw, *Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1884, p. 305 sqq. Comp. on the subject generally, Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Gebet." Hölemann, *Die biblische Gestalt der Anbetung*, in *Bibelstudien*, i. 96–153.

[118] On the summons to deliver the prayer by the archisynagogus, see above, vol. ii. p. 65; on שליח צבור, p. 67. The responsive אָמֵן is already found in the Old Testament, Deut. xxvii. 15 sqq.; Neh. viii. 6; 1 Chron. xvi. 36; Tob. viii. 8. See also *Berachoth* viii. 8; *Taanith* ii. 5. Also in Christian worship from the first, 1 Cor. xiv. 16. Justin, *Apol. maj.* 65, 67. See generally, Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald. s.v.* Vitringa, *De synagoga*, p. 1093 sqq. Wetzstein and other expositors on 1 Cor. xiv. 46; Suicer, *Thes. s.v.* ἀμήν. Otto's note on Justin, c. 65. Older literature in Wolf, *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.* on Matt. vi. 13 and 1 Cor. xiv. 16.

is the usual expression for "to lead in prayer."[119] Every adult member of the congregation was competent to do this.[120] The same individual, who said the prayer, might also recite the Shema, read the lesson from the prophets and, if he were a priest, pronounce the blessing.[121]

The *Scripture lessons* (from both the Pentateuch and the prophets) might also be read by any member of the congregation, and even by minors.[122] The latter were only excluded from reading the Book of Esther at the feast of Purim.[123] If *priests* and Levites were present, they took precedence in reading the lesson.[124] It was customary for the reader to stand (Luke iv. 16: *ἀνέστη ἀναγνῶναι*).[125] Both sitting and standing were allowed at the reading of the Book of Esther,[126] and the king was also allowed to sit when he read his portion of Scripture at the feast of Tabernacles in the Sabbatic year.[127] The lesson from the Thorah was so arranged that the whole Pentateuch consecutively was got through in a cycle of three

[119] *Berachoth* v. 3–4; *Erubin* iii. 9; *Rosh hashana* iv. 7; *Taanith* i. 2, ii. 5; *Megilla* iv. 3, 5, 6, 8. Comp. also *Taanith* ii. 2.

[120] *Megilla* iv. 6. In Christian congregations also the prayer was said by some member of them, see 1 Cor. xi. 4.

[121] *Megilla* iv. 5.

[122] *Megilla* iv. 5–6. That the reading of the Scripture lesson was not the work of a permanent official is evident from Philo, *Fragm. ap. Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 13 (see above, vol. ii. p. 76).

[123] *Megilla* ii. 4.

[124] *Gittin* v. 8: "The following things have been ordained for the sake of peace. The priest is the first to read, then the Levite, then the Israelite for the sake of peace." Maimonides testifies that it was the custom in his time to give an unlearned priest precedence in reading over a learned Israelite, a proceeding which indeed he does not approve. See Maimonides, *Commentary on Gittin* v. 8 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 341), and *Hilchoth Tephilla* xii. 18 (in Vitringa, p. 981). Comp. also Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1267. Philo too points out the precedence of the priests; only he assumes therewith that there would be but *one* to read the lesson, *Fragm. ap. Euseb. Praep. evang.* viii. 7. 13: *τῶν ἱερέων δέ τις ὁ παρὼν ἢ τῶν γερόντων εἷς.*

[125] Comp. *Joma* vii. 1; *Sota* vii. 7 (vol. ii. p. 64 sq.). Lightfoot on Luke iv. 16.

[126] *Megilla* iv. 1.

[127] *Sota* vii. 8.

years,[128] for which purpose it was divided into 154 sections (פָּרָשִׁיּוֹת).[129] On Sabbaths several members of the congregation, at the least seven, who were summoned for the purpose by some official, originally indeed by the ruler of the synagogue, took part in the reading.[130] The first and the last of these had to pronounce a thanksgiving (בְּרָכָה) at the beginning and at the end.[131] Each had (at the reading of the Thorah) to read at least *three* verses,[132] and might never repeat them by heart.[133] Such at least was the order prescribed by the Mishna, which certainly was observed only in the synagogues of Palestine. The Talmud expressly remarks of non-Hebraist Jews, that among them the whole Parashah was always read by one;[133a] and with this agrees Philo, who evidently assumes that the lesson from the Thorah was read by one person (see

[128] *Megilla* 29b.

[129] See Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 3 sq. Hupfeld, *Stud. und Krit.* 1837, p. 830 sq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 209–215. Grätz, *Ueber Entwickelung der Pentateuch-Perikopen-Verlesung* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1869, pp. 385–399). Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Vorlesung aus der Thora." The present custom of reading the Pentateuch in fifty-four sections in *one* year is of later origin.

[130] On the summons to the Thorah, see Vitringa, pp. 980, 1122 (after Maimonides). According to Maimonides this was certainly done by the *Chassan*. But he had in the post-Talmudic period an entirely different position from that which he formerly occupied. That it was originally done by the archisynagogus may be admitted as probable from his position in other respects. Rashi and Bartenora at least testify (in the passages named above, vol. ii. p. 65) that the archisynagogus (*Rosh hakeneseth*) had to determine who was to read the lesson from the prophets, the Shema, and the prayer.

[131] *Megilla* iv. 2. Maimonides in Vitringa, p. 983.

[132] *Megilla* iv. 4.

[133] Zunz, p. 5. Comp. *Megilla* ii. 1 (with respect to the Book of Esther). *Taanith* iv. 3 (where reciting by heart is mentioned as an exception).

[133a] *Jer. Megilla* iv. 3, fol. 75a (on the direction of the Mishna that on the Sabbath seven persons should always be called upon to read the Thorah). "The foreign-speaking Jews (הלעזות) have not this custom, but one person reads the whole Parashah." See the passage in Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 59, note, and in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* ii. 515a, *s.v.* לעז

the passages, vol. ii. p. 76). The reading of the law was already followed in New Testament times by a *paragraph from the prophets* (*i.e.* the נְבִיאִים, which include the older historical books), as we see from Luke iv. 17, where Jesus reads a section from Isaiah, and from Acts xiii. 15 : *ἀνάγνωσις τοῦ νόμου καὶ τῶν προφητῶν.* These lessons from the prophets are mentioned also in the Mishna.[134] As these formed the conclusion of the reading from the Scriptures, it was called הַפְטָיר בַּנָּבִיא (to close with the prophet), on which account the prophetic paragraphs were called Haphtaroth. For these no *lectio continua* was required ;[135] hence a choice of them was open,[136] and they were always read by one person.[137] They were moreover only read at the chief services on the Sabbath, and not also at week-day and Sabbath afternoon services.[138]

The sacred language in which the sections of Scripture were read aloud being no longer familiar to the bulk of the people, it was necessary to ensure their better understanding by *translation.* Hence the reading was accompanied by a continuous translation into the Aramaic dialect. Whether the translator (מְתוּרְגְּמָן) was a permanent official, or whether any competent members of the congregation officiated by turns as interpreters, must, in the absence of more definite evidence, be here left uncertain. In the lesson from the Thorah the reader had to read one verse at a time for the translator, in the lesson from the prophets three, unless one verse formed a separate paragraph, when he was then to read it also alone.[139]

[134] *Megilla* iv. 1–5. Further particulars in Vitringa, p. 984 sqq. Herzfeld, iii. 215 sqq. Adler, *Die Haftara* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. u. Wissensch. d. Judenth.* 1862, pp. 222–228). Hamburger, *Real-Enc. f. Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Haftara."

[135] *Megilla* iv. 4.

[136] Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 336. Comp. Luke iv. 17 sqq.

[137] *Megilla* iv. 5.

[138] *Megilla* iv. 1–2. Of the Kethubim only the five Megilloth were used, and these only on particular occasions in the year, in the synagogue service ; see Kisch, *Monatsschr.* 1880, p. 543 sqq.

[139] Comp. *Megilla* iv. 4, 6, 10. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1015–1022.

The reading of the Scriptures was followed by an edifying lecture or sermon (דְּרָשָׁה), by which the portion which had been read was explained and applied. That such explanations were the general practice is evident from the *διδάσκειν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς*,[140] so frequently mentioned in the New Testament, from Luke iv. 20 sqq., and from the express testimony of Philo (see above, p. 76). The preacher (דַּרְשָׁן)[141] used to *sit* (Luke iv. 20: *ἐκάθισεν*) on an elevated place.[142] Nor was such preaching confined to appointed persons, but, as appears especially from Philo, open to any competent member of the congregation.[142a] The service closed with *the blessing*, pronounced by a priestly member of the congregation, to which the whole congregation responded (אָמֵן).[143] If no

Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 8. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. "Targum." The like is also incidentally testified of Christian congregations. Thus in Scythopolis, in the time of Diocletian, the Scriptures were read in Greek, but translated by an interpreter into Aramaic. See the Syriac text of Euseb. *De mart. Palaest.* in Zahn, *Tatian's Diatessaron* (1881), p. 19.

[140] Matt. iv. 23; Mark i. 21, vi. 2; Luke iv. 15, vi. 6, xiii. 10; John vi. 59, xviii. 20.

[141] Ben Soma was a celebrated דַּרְשָׁן (*Sota* ix. 15).

[142] Comp. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge*, p. 337. Delitzsch, *Ein Tag in Capernaum*, p. 127 sq.

[142a] See Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, Div. ii. art. "Predigt."

[143] *Berachoth* v. 4. *Megilla* iv. 3, 5, 6, 7. On the *Blessing ritual*, see *Sota* vii. 6 (= *Tamid* vii. 2): "How is the priestly blessing pronounced? In the country in three sentences, in the temple in one. In the temple the name of God is pronounced as written (יהוה), in the country according to its appellation (אדוני). In the country the priests raise their hands only as high as the shoulder, in the temple above the head, with the exception of the high priest, who must not raise his hands above the plate of the mitre. R. Judah says: He also raised his hands above the plate of the mitre." According to *Rosh hashana* 31b, *Sota* 40b, Johanan ben Sakkai is said to have ordered that after the destruction of the temple the priests should only pronounce the blessing barefooted (Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 305, n. 3). On the whole subject, see Wagenseil on *Sota* vii. 6 (Surenhusius' *Mishna*, iii. 264 sq.). Vitringa, pp. 1114–1121. Lundius, *Die alten jüdischen Heiligthümer*, b. iii. c. 48. Haener, *De ritu benedictionis sacerdotalis*, Jenae 1671 (also in *Thesaurus theol. philologicus*, Amst. 1701–1702,

priest were present, the blessing was not pronounced, but made into a prayer.[144]

The order above described is that of the principal service on the forenoon of the Sabbath. The congregation assembled also on the Sabbath afternoon at the time of the Minchah offering. When then Philo says, that the Sabbath assemblies lasted *μέχρι σχεδὸν δείλης ὀψίας* (see above, p. 76), this is not without foundation considering the length of these services. At the afternoon service no lesson from the prophets, but only one from the Pentateuch, was read. And only *three* members of the congregation, neither more nor less, took part in the reading.[145] The same order was also observed at week-day services, which were regularly held on the second and fifth week-days (Mondays and Fridays).[146] There was also a meeting for the reading of the Thorah, in which *four* members of the congregation shared in the Parashah.[147] Nor was there any festival in the year, which was not distinguished by public worship and reading from the law; and the Mishna prescribed lessons from the Pentateuch for every festival.[148]

---

## APPENDIX.

### *The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh.*

The Shema and the Shemoneh Esreh occupy, on the one hand from their antiquity, on the other from the high estimation in which they were held, so prominent a position in the Jewish liturgy, that further particulars concerning them must here be given.

vol. ii. p. 936 sq.). Hottinger, *De benedictione sacerdotali*, Marburg 1709 (also in *Thesaurus novus theol.-phil.*, ed. Hasaeus et Ikenius, vol. i. p. 393 sqq.). Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1265, art. "Priestersegen."

144 Vitringa, p. 1120 (after Maimonides).

145 *Megilla* iii. 6, iv. 1.

146 *Megilla* iii. 6, iv. 1. Comp. i. 2, 3.

147 *Megilla* iv. 2.

148 *Megilla* iii. 5-6. Comp. Herzfeld, iii. 213. Hamburger, ii. 1265 sq. (art. "Vorlesung aus der Thora").

1. *The Shema*[149] consists of the three paragraphs, Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21, and Num. xv. 37–41; therefore of those passages of the Pentateuch, in which is chiefly inculcated that Jehovah alone is the God of Israel, and in which the use of certain mementos is prescribed for the constant remembrance of Him. The three paragraphs are expressly named in the Mishna by the words with which they begin: (1) שְׁמַע, (2) וְהָיָה אִם שָׁמֹעַ, and (3) וַיֹּאמֶר.[150] Around this nucleus are grouped at the beginning and end thanksgivings (Berachahs); and the Mishna prescribes that *two* benedictions should be said before, and *one* after, the morning Shema, and *two* before, and *two* after, the evening Shema.[151] The initial words of the concluding benediction are cited in the Mishna just as they are used to this day, viz. אֱמֶת וְיַצִּיב.[152] If then the wording of the benedictions was subsequently considerably increased, they still belong fundamentally to the period of the Mishna.[153] This prayer, or more correctly this *confession of faith*, was to be said twice a day, viz. morning and evening, by every adult male Israelite;[154] women, slaves and children were not required to repeat it.[155] It was not necessary that it should be recited in Hebrew, any other language being admissible for the purpose.[156] How ancient this custom of repeating the Shema was, appears from the fact that the Mishna already gives such detailed directions concerning it.[156a] It mentions moreover that it was already repeated by the priests in the temple, which assumes the use of it at least before A.D. 70.[157] Nay,

[149] See Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1052–1061. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, pp. 367, 369–371. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1087–1092.

[150] *Berachoth* ii. 2; *Tamid* v. 1. [151] *Berachoth* i. 4.

[152] *Berachoth* ii. 2; *Tamid* v. 1.

[153] Zunz (as above) has attempted to separate the ancient portions from the modern additions.

[154] *Berachoth* i. 1–4. [155] *Berachoth* iii. 3. [156] *Sota* vii. 1.

[156a] Comp. in general also, *Pesachim* iv. 8; *Taanith* iv. 3; *Sota* v. 4; *Aboth* ii. 13.

[157] *Tamid* iv. *fin.*, v. 1.

for Josephus the origin of this custom is lost in so hoar an antiquity, that he regards it as an enactment of Moses himself.[158]

2. *The Shemoneh Esreh.*[159] Somewhat more recent than the Shema, but still very ancient as to its groundwork, is the Shemoneh Esreh, *i.e.* the chief prayer, which every Israelite, even women, slaves and children, had to repeat three times a day, viz. morning, afternoon (at the time of the Minchah offering) and evening.[160] It is so much the chief prayer of the Israelite, that it is also called merely הַתְּפִלָּה, "the prayer." In its final, authentic and fixed form it does not consist, as its name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה denotes, of eighteen, but of nineteen Berachahs. Its words, as given in every Jewish prayer-book, are as follow:—

"1. Blessed art thou, O Lord, our God and the God of our fathers, the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, the God of Jacob, the great God, the mighty and tremendous, the Most High God, who bestowest gracious favours and createst all things, and rememberest the piety of the patriarchs, and wilt bring a redeemer to their posterity, for the sake of Thy name in love. O King, who bringest help and healing and art a shield. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the shield of Abraham. 2. Thou art mighty for ever, O Lord; Thou restorest life to the dead, Thou art mighty to save; who sustainest the living with beneficence, quickenest the dead with great mercy, supporting the fallen and healing the sick, and setting at liberty

---

158 Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 13: Δὶς δ' ἑκάστης ἡμέρας, ἀρχομένης τε αὐτῆς καὶ ὁπότε πρὸς ὕπνον ὥρα τρέπεσθαι, μαρτυρεῖν τῷ θεῷ τὰς δωρεὰς ἃς ἀπαλλαγεῖσιν αὐτοῖς ἐκ τῆς Αἰγυπτίων γῆς παρέσχε, δικαίας οὔσης Φύσει τῆς εὐχαριστίας καὶ γενομένης ἐπ' ἀμοιβῇ μὲν τῶν ἤδη γεγονότων ἐπὶ δὲ προτροπῇ τῶν ἐσομένων. That Josephus means by this the custom of reciting the Shema cannot be doubtful. He rightly views the Shema as a thankful confession of Jehovah, as the God who redeemed Israel from Egypt. Comp. especially, Num. xv. 41.

159 See Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1031–1051. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstl. Vorträge*, pp. 367–369. Delitzsch, *Zur Gesch. der jüdischen Poesie* (1836), pp. 191–193. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 200–204. Bickell, *Messe und Pashah* (1872), pp. 65 sq., 71–73. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1092–1099.

160 *Berachoth* iii. 3 (women, children, slaves), iv. 1 (three times a day).

those who are bound, and upholding Thy faithfulness unto those who sleep in the dust. Who is like unto Thee, Lord, the Almighty One; or who can be compared unto Thee, O King, who killest and makest alive again, and causest help to spring forth? And faithful art Thou to quicken the dead. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest the dead. 3. Thou art holy and Thy name is holy, and the saints daily praise Thee. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord; the God most holy. 4. Thou graciously impartest to man knowledge, and teachest to mortals reason. Let us be favoured from Thee with knowledge, understanding and wisdom. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who graciously impartest knowledge. 5. Cause us to turn, O our Father, to Thy law, and draw us near, O our King, to Thy service, and restore us in perfect repentance to Thy presence. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who delightest in repentance. 6. Forgive us, our Father, for we have sinned; pardon us, our King, for we have transgressed; ready to pardon and forgive Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, most gracious, who dost abundantly pardon. 7. Look, we beseech Thee, upon our afflictions, and plead our cause and redeem us speedily for the sake of Thy name, for a mighty Redeemer Thou art. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the Redeemer of Israel. 8. Heal us, O Lord, and we shall be healed; save us, and we shall be saved; for our praise art Thou; and bring forth a perfect remedy unto all our infirmities; for a God and King, a faithful healer, and most merciful art Thou. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who healest the diseases of Thy people Israel. 9. Bless unto us, O Lord our God, this year and grant us an abundant harvest, and bring a blessing on our land, and satisfy us with Thy goodness; and bless our year as the good years. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who blessest the years. 10. Sound with the great trumpet to announce our freedom; and set up a standard to collect our captives, and gather us together from the four corners of the earth. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who gatherest the outcasts of Thy people Israel. 11. O restore our judges as formerly, and our counsellors as at the beginning; and remove from us sorrow and sighing; and reign over us, Thou O Lord alone, in grace and mercy; and justify us. Blessed art Thou, O Lord the King, for Thou lovest Righteousness and justice. 12. To slanderers let there be no hope, and let all workers of wickedness perish as in a moment; and let all of them speedily be cut off; and humble them speedily in our days. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who destroyest enemies and humblest tyrants. 13. Upon the just and upon the pious and upon the elders of Thy people the house of Israel, and upon the remnant of their scribes, and upon righteous strangers, and upon us, bestow, we beseech Thee, Thy mercy, O Lord our God, and grant a good reward unto all who confide in Thy

name faithfully; and appoint our portion with them for ever, and may we never be put to shame, for our trust is in Thee. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the support and confidence of the righteous. 14. And to Jerusalem Thy city return with compassion, and dwell therein as Thou hast promised; and rebuild her speedily in our days, a structure everlasting; and the throne of David speedily establish therein. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, the builder of Jerusalem. 15. The offspring of David Thy servant speedily cause to flourish, and let his horn be exalted in Thy salvation; for Thy salvation do we hope daily. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who causest the horn of salvation to flourish. 16. Hear our voice, O Lord our God, pity and have mercy upon us, and accept with compassion and favour these our prayers, for Thou art a God who heareth prayers and supplications; and from Thy presence, O our King, send us not empty away, for Thou hearest the prayers of Thy people Israel in mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who hearest prayer. 17. Be pleased, O Lord our God, with Thy people Israel, and with their prayers; and restore the sacrificial service to the Holy of Holies of Thy house; and the offerings of Israel, and their prayers in love do Thou accept with favour; and may the worship of Israel Thy people be ever pleasing. O that our eyes may behold Thy return to Zion with mercy. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, who restorest Thy glory (שְׁכִינָה) unto Zion. 18. We praise Thee, for Thou art the Lord our God and the God of our fathers for ever and ever; the Rock of our life, the Shield of our salvation, Thou art for ever and ever. We will render thanks unto Thee, and declare Thy praise, for our lives which are delivered into Thy hand, and for our souls which are deposited with Thee, and for Thy miracles which daily are with us; and for Thy wonders and Thy goodness, which are at all times, evening and morning and at noon. Thou art good for Thy mercies fail not, and compassionate for Thy loving-kindness never ceaseth; our hopes are for ever in Thee. And for all this praised and extolled be Thy name, our King, for ever and ever. And all that live shall give thanks unto Thee for ever, Selah, and shall praise Thy name in truth; the God of our salvation and our aid for ever. Selah. Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for all-bountiful is Thy name, and unto Thee it becometh us to give thanks. 19. Great salvation bring over Israel Thy people for ever, for Thou art King, Lord of all salvation. Praised be Thou, Lord, for Thou blessest Thy people Israel with salvation."

From the contents of this prayer it is evident, that it first attained its finally authentic form after the destruction of Jerusalem, that is, after A.D. 70. For it presupposes in its

14th and 17th Berachah the destruction of the city and the cessation of the sacrificial service. On the other hand, it is already cited in the Mishna under the name שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה,[161] and it is mentioned, that R. Gamaliel II., R. Joshua, R. Akiba and R. Elieser—all authorities of the beginning of the second century—debated whether all the eighteen thanksgivings or only a selection from them must be said daily,[162] also in what manner the additions concerning the rainy season and the Sabbath should be inserted, and in what form to pray on New Year's day.[163] Hence it must have virtually attained its present form about A.D. 70–100, and its groundwork may safely be regarded as considerably more ancient. This inference is confirmed by the definite information of the Talmud, that Simon the cotton dealer at Jabne in the time of Gamaliel II. arranged the eighteen thanksgivings according to their order, and that Samuel the Little, at R. Gamaliel's invitation, inserted the prayer against apostates (מִינִים), which makes it consist, not of eighteen, but of nineteen sections.[164]

[161] *Berachoth* iv. 3; *Taanith* ii. 2. [162] *Berachoth* iv. 3.

[163] *Berachoth* v. 2; *Rosh hashana* iv. 5; *Taanith* i. 1–2. At the close of the Sabbath the so-called הַבְדָּלָה, *i.e.* the "separation," by which the Sabbath was separated from the week-day, was inserted. See *Berachoth* v. 2 (in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, i. 18). Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* הבדלה.

[164] *Berachoth* 28b: יִשְׁמָעֵאל הַפַּקּוֹלִי הִסְדִּיר שְׁמוֹנֶה עֶשְׂרֵה בְּרָכוֹת לִפְנֵי רַבָּן גַּמְלִיאֵל עַל הַסֵּדֶר בִּיבְנֶה. אָמַר לָהֶם רַבָּן גַּמְלִיאֵל לַחֲכָמִים, כְּלוּם יֵשׁ אָדָם שֶׁיּוֹדֵעַ לְתַקֵּן בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים? עָמַד שְׁמוּאֵל הַקָּטָן וְתִקְּנָהּ. The question is immediately before asked, why there are nineteen instead of eighteen Berachoth. The בִּרְכַּת הַמִּינִים (for this is undoubtedly the correct reading instead of בִּרְכַּת הַצַּדּוֹקִים, which the editions have, see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* מין) forms the 12th Berachah. But instead of the original מִינִים, we have in the present text of the prayer מַלְשִׁינִים (slanderers), the former being corrected by the insertion of only two letters. Comp. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 345 sq. The מִינִים are "apostates" in general, not merely Jewish Christians, as is often supposed. The Fathers were not however quite in the wrong when they referred the *Birkath hamminim* chiefly to Jewish Christians. Comp. Epiphan. *haer.* xxix. 9: Οὐ μόνον γὰρ οἱ τῶν Ἰουδαίων παῖδες πρὸς τούτους κέκτηνται μῖσος, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀνιστάμενοι ἔωθεν καὶ μέσης ἡμέρας καὶ περὶ τὴν ἑσπέραν, τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας, ὅτε εὐχὰς

ἐπιτελοῦσιν ἑαυτοῖς ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς, ἐπαρῶνται αὐτοῖς, καὶ ἀναθεματίζουσι τρὶς τῆς ἡμέρας φάσκοντες ὅτι Ἐπικαταράσαι ὁ θεὸς τοὺς Ναζωραίους. Hieronymus *ad Jesaj.* v. 18–19, ed. Vallarsi, iv. 81: (Judaei) usque hodie perseverant in blasphemiis et ter per singulos dies in omnibus synagogis sub nomine Nazarenorum anathematizant vocabulum Christianum. Idem, *ad Jesaj.* xlix. 7, ed. Vallarsi, iv. 565: (Judaei Christo) ter per singulos dies sub nomine Nazarenorum maledicunt in synagogis suis. Idem, *ad Jesaj.* lii. 4 ff., ed. Vallarsi, iv. 604: (Judaei) diebus ac noctibus blasphemant Salvatorem et sub nomine, ut saepe dixi, Nazarenorum ter in die in Christianos congerunt maledicta. Less decidedly Justinus, *Dialog. c. Tryph.* c. 16: Καταρώμενοι ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς ὑμῶν τοὺς πιστεύοντας ἐπὶ τὸν Χριστόν. Justin frequently expresses himself in the same manner (see Otto on the passage). Comp. also especially c. 137: Συμφάμενοι οὖν μὴ λοιδορῆτε ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ θεοῦ, μηδὲ Φαρισαίοις πειθόμενοι διδασκάλοις τὸν βασιλέα τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπισκώψητέ ποτε, ὁποῖα διδάσκουσιν οἱ ἀρχισυνάγωγοι ὑμῶν, μετὰ τὴν προσευχήν. It is striking, that according to this, the cursing formula was pronounced *after the prayer.* Perhaps this rests upon a mistake of Justin's; it is however also possible that the *Birkath hamminim* originally had this position. Comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1201 sq. Vitringa, *De synagoga*, pp. 1047–1051. Herzfeld, iii. 203 sq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 434 sq. Derenbourg, p. 345 sq. Hamburger, ii. 1095 sq.

## § 28. LIFE UNDER THE LAW.

### I.

All zeal for education in the family, the school and the synagogue aimed at making *the whole people a people of the law.* The common man too was to know what the law commanded, and not only to know, but to do it. His whole life was to be ruled according to the norm of the law; obedience thereto was to become a fixed custom, and departure therefrom an inward impossibility. On the whole this object was to a great degree attained. Josephus declares: "Even if we are deprived of wealth, of towns, and of other possessions, the law remains to us for ever. And no Jew will be so far from his native land, nor so much fear a hostile ruler, as not to fear the law more than him."[1] So faithfully did most of the Jews adhere to their law, that they willingly incurred even torture and death itself in consequence. "Often already," says Josephus, "have many of the prisoners been seen to endure the rack and all kinds of death in theatres, for the sake of not uttering a word against the law and the other Holy Scriptures."[2]

But what were the motives, whence sprang this enthusiasm

[1] *Apion.* ii. 38: Κἂν πλούτου καὶ πόλεων καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἀγαθῶν στερηθῶμεν, ὁ γοῦν νόμος ἡμῖν ἀθάνατος διαμένει· καὶ οὐδεὶς Ἰουδαίων οὔτε μακρὰν οὕτως ἂν ἀπέλθοι τῆς πατρίδος οὔτ' ἐπίπικρον φοβηθήσεται δεσπότην ὡς μὴ πρὸ ἐκείνου δεδιέναι τὸν νόμον.

[2] *Apion.* i. 8: Ἤδη οὖν πολλοὶ πολλάκις ἑώρανται τῶν αἰχμαλώτων στρέβλας καὶ παντοίων θανάτων τρόπους ἐν θεάτροις ὑπομένοντες ἐπὶ τῷ μηδὲν ῥῆμα προεῖσθαι παρὰ τοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς μετὰ τούτων ἀναγραφάς. Comp. also *Apion.* i. 22 (from Hekataus), and ii. 30: πολλοὶ καὶ πολλάκις ἤδη τῶν ἡμετέρων περὶ τοῦ μηδὲ ῥῆμα φθέγξασθαι παρὰ τὸν νόμον πάντα παθεῖν γενναίως προείλοντο.

for the law, what the means whereby it obtained this enormous sway over minds? To answer briefly: it was *faith in Divine retribution*, and that a retribution in the strictest juristic sense. The prophetic idea of the covenant, which God had entered into with the chosen people, was apprehended in the purely juristic sense; the covenant was a legal one, by which both the contracting parties were mutually bound. The people to observe the law given them by God, exactly, accurately and conscientiously: while God was also bound in return to pay the promised recompense in proportion to their performances. And the obligation held good not only with respect to the nation as a whole, but to every individual; performance and recompense always stood in corresponding relations to each other. He who did much had to expect from God's justice the bestowal of much reward; while on the other hand every trangression entailed its corresponding punishment.[3] The externalism with which this belief in retribution weighed, on the one side transgression and punishment, on the other the fulfilment of the law and reward by each other, will appear from what follows: "Seven different plagues came into the world on account of seven chief transgressions. (1) If part of the people tithe their fruits and part do not, such a famine arises through drought that part of the people are in want and part have enough. (2) If no one tithes, there follows a famine from the devastations of war and from drought. (3) If nowhere the heave dough has been separated, a famine consuming all arises. (4) A pestilence rages when such crimes gain the upper hand as have in Scripture the penalty of death pronounced upon them, but whose perpetrators are not delivered up to justice for its

[3] Comp. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie* (1880), pp. 235 ff., 290 ff. Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. art. "Lohn und Strafe" (pp. 691–703), and "Vergeltung" (pp. 1252–1257).

execution. (5) War devastates the land because of delay of sentences, turning aside of law and illegal interpretation of Scripture. (6) Wild beasts get the upper hand on account of perjury and the desecration of the divine name. (7) Carrying away into foreign lands is the punishment for idolatry, incest, murder, and neglect of the Sabbatic year."[4] With like conscientiousness was the reward for the fulfilling of the law computed. "Whoever fulfils only *one* law, good is appointed to him, his days are prolonged, and he will inherit the land."[5] "According to the proportion of pains taken will be the reward" (לְפוּם צַעֲרָא אַגְרָא).[6] "Know that everything is taken account of" (דַּע שֶׁהַכֹּל לְפִי הַחֶשְׁבּוֹן).[7] Thus every fulfilment of the law involves its corresponding reward. And God only gave so many commandments and so many laws to the people of Israel, that they might obtain great rewards.[8] Both punishment and reward are bestowed on men in the present life. But full retribution does not follow till the life to come, the עוֹלָם הַבָּא. Then will all seeming inequalities be reconciled. He, who was in this life visited with sorrows, notwithstanding his righteousness, will then receive the fuller reward. But apart from this, full recompense does not take place till the world to come. For the present world is still a world of imperfection and of evil. In the future world all weakness will cease. Then will Israel, both as a nation and as individuals, be rewarded for a faithful fulfilling of the law by a life of undisturbed happiness. Good works—such as reverence of parents, benevolence, peace-making among neighbours, and above all the study of the law—may therefore be looked upon as a capital, whose interest is already enjoyed in this life,

[4] *Aboth* v. 8–9. So too *e.g. Shabbath* ii. 6. The promises and threats of the blessing and the curse in Lev. xxvi. and Deut. xxviii. are the Old Testament foundation for this. But the casuistic carrying out into parallels is alien to the Old Testament.

[5] *Kiddushin* i. 10.

[6] *Aboth* v. 23.

[7] *Aboth* iv. 22.

[8] *Makkoth* iii. 16.

while the capital itself remains for the life to come. *This hope of a future retribution was therefore the mainspring of all zeal for the law. Nay the entire religious life of the Jewish people during the period of which we are treating just revolved round these two poles: Fulfilment of the law and hope of future glory.* Zeal for the former derived its vitality from the latter. The saying of Antigonus of Socho: "Be not like servants who serve their master for the sake of reward, but be like those who do service without respect to reward,"[10] is by no means a correct expression of the keynote of Pharisaic Judaism, which was in fact like the servants who serve for the sake of recompense.

To what *results* then did this zeal for the law lead? They corresponded with its motives. As the motives were essentially of an external kind, so also was the result *an incredible externalizing of the religious and moral life.* This result was indeed inevitable, when once religion was made into law, and that indeed in such wise, that all religion was made to consist in nothing else, than in the strict obedience to a law, which regulated the civil and social as well as the individual life in all its relations. By this view of religious duty, which forms the characteristic distinction of post-exilian Judaism, *the whole religious and moral life was drawn down into the sphere of law, and the result necessarily was as follows:* (1) First of all the individual life was thus regulated by a norm, whose application to this sphere at all is an evil. The province of law is simply to order the relations of men to one another according to certain standards. Its object is not the individual as such, but only civil society as a whole. The functions of the latter are to be so regulated, that the fulfilment of his individual task within this framework is to be made possible to each. The application of the legal norm to the individual life therefore of itself subjects the latter to a false standard. For if external constraint is of the essence of law, freedom is of the

[9] *Pea* i. 1. Comp. *Kiddushin* iv. 14. [10] *Aboth* i. 3.

essence of moral action. The moral life of the individual is a healthy one, only when it is governed by internal motives. Its regulation by external standards is an adulteration of it in its very principle. (2) The application of the legal norm to the religious and moral life also involves the placing of the most varying avocations of life upon a level, as though of equal value. For every employment is regulated absolutely by the law, not merely the behaviour of men to one another in the State and in society, but also those most special manifestations of the inner life of the individual: how he shows his gratitude to God or evidences his repentance for sins he has committed, how he manifests his love to his neighbour, how he fashions his daily life in its most external respects, in manners and customs. All falls under the same point of view—under the norm of the law, and that a law which comes forward with Divine authority. Thus the purport of an act is comparatively indifferent. Merely conventional demeanour in outward matters and ceremonies is of the same value as the fulfilment of the highest religious and moral duties. The former is raised to the rank of the latter, and the latter lowered to that of the former. There is always and everywhere only one duty—the fulfilling of the law, *i.e.* the fulfilling of all that has once been commanded by God, no matter of what kind it may be. (3) Hence it is self-evident, that all in reality depends upon satisfying the law. There is no higher task in the department of law. If the requirement of the law is exactly fulfilled, duty is satisfied. Thus the only question that can be raised is: what is commanded? and what must be done that the commandment may be fulfilled? That every art should be directed only to compounding with the letter of the law is an inevitable consequence. This task will perhaps be aggravated, more rather than less will be done for the sake of meeting in practice the whole extent of the law. But still one purpose only will be kept in view, that of satisfying the

letter. And this cannot be done without damage to the substance. The real value of the good is left out of account. Not the doing of the good as such, but merely formal accuracy in fulfilling the letter of the law is the aim. And notwithstanding all zeal, nay just because of it, true morality must of necessity be a loser. (4) Lastly the purely formal point of sight has the further consequence, that the moral duty is split up into an endless atomistic multitude of separate duties and obligations. All law is necessarily casuistic, for it lays down a multiplicity of individual statutes. All casuistry is by its nature endless. The *one* case may have been divided into ever so many sub-species; but each sub-species can again be split into sub-divisions, and there is here no end to the dividing. The most conspicuous proof of this is furnished by the marvellous labours of the Pharisaic scribes. With all their diligence and acuteness in making distinctions, they never came to an end. But the testimony cannot be refused them, that they really worked hard to do so. Jewish law became in their hands a widely ramified science. They cut up the law into thousands upon thousands of single commands, and thus, as far as in them lay, set up a rule for the direction of every conceivable case of practical life. Marvellous however as were their performances, it is here that their most grievous error is found. All free moral action was now completely crushed under the burden of numberless separate statutory requirements. The greater their number, the more fatal is the effect of the fundamental error of transferring the juristic mode of treatment to the region of religion and morality. In every department of life action no longer proceeds from inward motive, is no longer the free manifestation of a moral disposition, but results from the external constraint of statutory requirement. And such requirement reaches equally to everything, to the greatest as to the least, to the most important as to the most indifferent; every act,

whether great or trifling, when estimated by a moral standard, is now of the same value; there is but one point of view for all: to do what is commanded, because it is commanded. And thus there is of course no higher vocation, than to be faithful to the letter for the letter's sake. All depends, not on the inward motive, but on the external correctness of an action. And all this petty and mistaken zeal insisted finally on being the true and genuine service of God. The more men wearied themselves out with it, the more they thought to gain the Divine approbation. As St. Paul says: *ζῆλον θεοῦ ἔχουσιν, ἀλλ' οὐ κατ' ἐπίγνωσιν* (Rom. x. 2). How far this unwise zeal for God went astray, and what a heavy burden it laid upon the life of the Israelite, may be made evident by a series of concrete examples.[11]

## II.

One of the most important points, both with respect to its extent and the value attributed to it, was that of Sabbath sanctification.[12] The brief prohibition of work on the Sabbath which is found in the Pentateuch, and which hardly at all enters into detail (Ex. xvi. 23–30, xx. 8–11, xxiii. 12, xxxi. 12–17, xxxiv. 21, xxxv. 1–3; Lev. xxiii. 3; Num. xv. 32–36;

[11] In this series those points are chiefly brought forward, which are touched on in the Gospels. It should then be remembered, with respect to *the date* to which the material here adduced belongs, that the authorities cited in the Mishna almost all belong to the hundred years between A.D. 70–170. Hence Jewish law is here presented to us in that form which it maintained in about the first half of the second century. This form will however be essentially that which is handed down from the beginning of the Christian era, from the time of Hillel and Shammai. For the differences of their two schools already related to the subtlest distinctions.

[12] Comp. in the Mishna the treatises *Shabbath*, *Erubin*, *Beza*, the *Book of Jubilees*, cap. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70); also Winer, *Realwörterb.* ii. 343–349. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xiii. 193–204 (in the 2nd ed. revised by Orelli, xiii. 156–166). Saalschütz, *Das Mosaische Recht*, i. 388 sqq. Mangold in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 123–126. Riehm's *Wörterb. s.v.*

Deut. v. 12–15. Comp. Jer. xvii. 21–24; Amos vii. 5; Neh. x. 32, xiii. 15 sqq.), was in the course of time developed in so many-sided a manner as to form of itself an extensive branch of knowledge. For of course the Rabbis could not rest satisfied with this simple prohibition. They must also accurately define *what work* was forbidden. And consequently they at last, with much ingenuity, got out of it, that on the whole thirty-nine kinds of work were prohibited, but very few are of course anywhere alluded to in the Pentateuch. These thirty-nine prohibited works are: (1) sowing, (2) ploughing, (3) reaping, (4) binding sheaves, (5) threshing, (6) winnowing, (7) cleansing crops, (8) grinding, (9) sifting, (10) kneading, (11) baking, (12) shearing wool, (13) washing, (14) beating, (15) dyeing, (16) spinning, and (17) warping it, (18) making two cords, (19) weaving two threads, (20) separating two threads, (21) making a knot, (22) untying a knot, (23) sewing two stitches, (24) tearing to sew two stitches, (25) catching a deer, (26) killing, (27) skinning, and (28) salting it, (29) preparing its skin, (30) scraping off the hair, (31) cutting it up, (32) writing two letters, (33) blotting out for the purpose of writing two letters, (34) building, (35) pulling down, (36) putting out a fire, (37) lighting a fire, (38) beating smooth with a hammer, (39) carrying from one tenement to another.[13]

Each of these chief enactments again require further discussions concerning their range and meaning. And here, properly speaking, begins the work of casuistry. We will bring forward just a few of its results. According to Ex. xxxiv., ploughing and reaping were among the forbidden works. But to gather a few ears of corn was already looked upon as reaping.[13a]

[13] *Shabbath* vii. 2. The translation here and in what follows is always that of Jost's edition of the Mishna. Comp. also the enumeration in the *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70).

[13a] Comp. Maimonides in Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Matt. xii. 2.

When on one occasion the disciples did this on the Sabbath, they were found fault with by the Pharisees, not on account of plucking the ears, which (according to Deut. xxiii. 26) was permitted, but because they were thus guilty of doing reaping work on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 1, 2; Mark ii. 23, 24; Luke vi. 1, 2). The prohibition of making and untying a knot (Nos. 21 and 22) was much too general to rest satisfied with. It was also necessary to state to what kind of knot this *applied, and to what it did not.* "*The following* are the knots, the making of which renders a man guilty: The knot of camel-drivers and that of sailors; and as one is guilty by reason of tying, so also of untying them. R. Meir says: Guilt is not incurred by reason of a knot, which can be untied with one hand. There are knots by reason of which one is not guilty, as one is in the case of the camel-driver's and sailor's knots. A woman may tie up a slit in her shift and the strings of her cap, those of her girdle, the straps of the shoes and sandals, of skins of wine and oil, of a pot with meat."[14] And to tie strings of the girdle being permitted, it was agreed that a pail also might be tied over the well with a girdle, but not with a rope.[15] The prohibition of writing on the Sabbath (No. 32) was further defined as follows: "He who writes two letters with his right or his left hand, whether of one kind or of two kinds, as also if they are written with different ink or are of different languages, is guilty. He even who should from forgetfulness write two letters is guilty, whether he has written them with ink or with paint, red chalk, India-rubber, vitriol, or anything which makes permanent marks. Also he who writes on two walls which form an angle, or on the two tablets of his account-book, so that they can be read together, is guilty. He who writes upon his body is guilty. If any one writes with dark fluid, with fruit juice, or in the dust on the road, in sand, or in anything in which

[14] *Shabbath* xv. 1–2. [15] *Shabbath* xv. 2.

the writing does not remain, he is free.[16] If any one writes with the wrong hand, with the foot, with the mouth, with the elbow; also if any one writes upon a letter of another piece of writing, or covers other writing; also if any one meaning to write ח has only written two ז ז, or if any one has written one letter on the ground and one upon the wall, or upon two walls of the house, or upon two pages of a book, so that they cannot be read together, he is free. If in forgetfulness he writes two letters at different times, perhaps one in the morning and one towards evening, R. Gamaliel pronounces him guilty, the learned declare him free."[17] According to Ex. xvi. 23, it was forbidden to bake and to boil on the Sabbath. Hence the food, which it was desired to eat hot on the Sabbath, was to be prepared before its commencement, and kept warm by artificial means. In doing this however care must be taken, that the existing heat was not increased, which would have been "boiling." Hence the food must be put only into such substances as would maintain its heat, not into such as might possibly increase it. "Food to be kept warm for the Sabbath must not be put into oil-dregs, manure, salt, chalk, or sand, whether moist or dry, nor into straw, grape-skins, flock, or vegetables, if these are damp, though it may if they are dry. It may, however, be put into clothes, amidst fruits, pigeons' feathers, and flax-tow. R. Jehudah declares flax-tow unallowable, and permits only coarse tow."[18] According to Ex. xxxv. 3, it was forbidden to kindle a fire on the Sabbath.

[16] On the statements "he is guilty" (חייב) and "he is free" (פטור), see Jost's introd. to the treatise *Shabbath*. The former means: the wilful transgressor forfeits his life, and is, if there are witnesses, to be stoned, or if he has sinned after warning, but without witnesses, he is sentenced to the penalty of extirpation. And he who has sinned from negligence or ignorance must offer the legal sin-offering. פטור means he is free from these penalties, but not from the scourging ordered by the court, so that the act itself (a few cases deducted) *is not thereby declared allowable.*

[17] *Shabbath* xii. 3–6.

[18] *Shabbath* iv. 1, and the commentary in Surenhusius' *Mishna*, ii. 18.

This prohibition was supplemented by that of extinguishing a fire. With regard to the latter, the question arose, how it was to be observed, when a non-Israelite approached a fire. "If a non-Israelite comes to extinguish a fire, one must neither say to him: 'put it out,' nor 'do not put it out,' and that because one is not obliged to make him rest."[19] It is self-evident that the prohibition to extinguish fire would be extended to lights and lamps. Concerning these it was ordained as follows: "He who extinguishes a light because he is afraid of heathen, robbers, or the evil spirit, or for the sake of one sick, that he may sleep, is free. If it is done however to save the oil, the lamp, or the wick, he is guilty. R. Joses declares him in each case free, except with respect to the wick, because he thus prepares, as it were, a coal."[20] "A vessel may be placed under a lamp to catch the sparks, but water may not be put therein, lest the lamp be extinguished."[21] Very specially copious material for discussion was furnished by the last of the thirty-nine chief works, the carrying a burden from one tenement to another (הַמּוֹצִיא מֵרְשׁוּת לִרְשׁוּת), which was, according to Jer. xvii. 21–24, forbidden. We shall see farther on, what refined sophistry was applied towards enlarging the notion of the רְשׁוּת. It may here be briefly mentioned, that even the bulk of what might not be carried from one place to another on the Sabbath was exactly determined. Thus *e.g.* he was guilty of Sabbath desecration who carried out so much food as was equal in weight to a dry fig,[22] or so much wine as was enough for mixing in a goblet, or milk enough for one swallow, honey enough to put upon a wound, oil enough to anoint a small member, water enough to moisten an eye-salve,[23] paper enough to write a custom-house notice upon,[24] parchment enough to write the shortest portion of the Tephillin, *i.e.* the

[19] *Shabbath* xvi. 6.
[20] *Shabbath* ii. 5.
[21] *Shabbath* ii. 6, *fin.*
[22] *Shabbath* vii. 4.
[23] *Shabbath* viii. 1.
[24] *Shabbath* viii. 2.

שמע ישראל, upon, ink enough to write two letters,[25] reed enough to make a pen of, etc.[26] It was forbidden also to carry such garments as did not belong to clothing proper. A warrior might not go out with coat of mail, helmet, greaves, sword, bow, shield, or spear.[27] A cripple might, according to R. Meir, go out with his wooden leg. R. Joses, on the other hand, does not allow it.[28] Only on the breaking out of a fire are some concessions made with respect to burden-bearing. "All the Holy Scriptures may be saved from a conflagration. The case of the book may be saved with the book, that of the Tephillin with the Tephillin, even if there is money in it. Food for the three Sabbath meals may be saved. If a fire breaks out on the evening of the Sabbath, let food be saved for three meals; if it takes place in the forenoon, for two; if in the afternoon, for one only. A basketful of bread may also be saved, even if enough for a hundred meals, a cake of figs, a cask of wine."[29]

The caution of these guardians of the law did not however confine itself to asserting what was forbidden on the Sabbath itself. They extended their prohibitions to every transaction, which might only possibly lead to a desecration of the Sabbath. This prophylactic care was the cause of the following enactments: "Let not a tailor go out at twilight with his needle, for he might forget (when the Sabbath begins) and go out with it. Nor the writer with his reed."[30] "Meat, onions and eggs may not be cooked, unless there is time to cook them by day. Bread may not be put into the oven in the twilight, nor cakes upon the coals, unless their surfaces can harden while it is still day. R. Elieser says: If there is only time for the under surface to harden."[31] Caution goes still farther, when *e.g.* it is forbidden to read by lamplight on the Sabbath, or to cleanse clothing from vermin.

[25] *Shabbath* viii. 3. [26] *Shabbath* viii. 5. [27] *Shabbath* vi. 2, 4.
[28] *Shabbath* vi. 8. [29] *Shabbath* xvi. 1–3. [30] *Shabbath* i. 3.
[31] *Shabbath* i. 10.

For both are transactions in which a clear light is especially necessary. And thus there is obviously a temptation to stoop the lamp for the purpose of leading more oil to it, and this would offend against the prohibition of kindling fire. Hence these actions are altogether forbidden. It is indeed permitted to a schoolmaster to take care how children read by light. But he himself may not read by a light.[32]

Besides these thirty-nine chief *works*, many other actions and employments, which cannot be summed up under any of them, are also forbidden. We learn of some of them *e.g.* from the following prescription with regard to the holy days (on which the rest was less strict). "All things, by which punishment is incurred on the Sabbath, because of their breaking its rest, or because of acts arbitrary in themselves, or acts legal at other times, are also not allowed on the holy day. The following because of the rest: one may not climb a tree, ride upon a horse, swim in the water, clap with the hands, strike upon the hips, or dance. The following because the acts are arbitrary: one may not hold a court of justice, acquire a wife by earnest money, pull off the shoe (the Chaliza on account of a refusal of levirate marriage), nor consummate levirate marriage. The following because they are legal transactions: one may not consecrate anything, put a value on anything, devote anything, nor separate heave and tithe. All this is declared unlawful on a holy day, not to mention a Sabbath."[33] To such appointments belongs also the enactment, that no one should on the Sabbath go farther than 2000 cubits from his dwelling, *i.e.* from where he is at the beginning of the Sabbath. This was called the "Sabbath limit," תְּחוּם הַשַּׁבָּת,[34] and a distance of 2000 cubits a Sabbath day's journey (Acts i. 12: *σαββάτου ὁδός*). How ingeniously this

[32] *Shabbath* i. 3.

[33] *Beza* v. 2.

[34] *Erubin* v. 5. The distance of 2000 cubits (according to Num. xxxv. 1–8), *Erubin* iv. 3, 7, v. 7. Compare in general, Buxtorf, *Lexicon Chaldaicum*,

prescription, founded on Ex. xvi. 29, as well as that concerning the carrying of burdens, was evaded, will be shown farther on.

Notwithstanding the great strictness with which the commandment to hallow the Sabbath was treated, certain cases, in which exceptions were tolerated, had of necessity to be acknowledged. Some such exceptions were allowed for the sake of humanity and some on account of a still higher and more sacred command. In the latter respect the necessities of the temple-ritual came especially under consideration. The daily burnt-offering must be offered on the Sabbath also, nay a special offering besides was ordered on the Sabbath day (Num. xxviii. 9, 10). Hence it was self-evident, that all the transactions necessary for offering these sacrifices must be lawful even on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 5 : *τοῖς σάββασιν οἱ ἱερεῖς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ τὸ σάββατον βεβηλοῦσιν καὶ ἀναίτιοί εἰσιν*).[35] The acts necessary for offering the Passover sacrifice were also allowed on the Sabbath, but in this case it was very carefully settled what transactions were and what were not permitted.[36] To the same category belongs also the command of circumcision. All that was necessary for circumcision might be done on the Sabbath, so far, that is, as it could not be done on the day before. For whatever could have been done on the day before was forbidden.[37] For the sake of humanity it was permitted to render assistance to

col. 2582–2586 (*s.v.* תחם). Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Acts i. 12. Winer, *RWB.* ii. 350 sq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xiii. 203 sq. Leyrer, *ibid.* xiii. 213 sq. Arnold, *ibid.* ix. 148 (all according to the 1st ed.). Mangold in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 127 sq.

[35] Comp. *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70). Lightfoot, Schöttgen, Wetzstein on Matt. xii. 5. Wolf, *Curae philol.* on the same passage. Wünsche, *Der lebensfreudige Jesus* (1876), p. 424.

[36] *Pesachim* vi. 1–2. On other exceptions from the Sabbath command in favour of the temple service, see also *Erubin* x. 11–15.

[37] *Shabbath* xix. 1–5. Comp. John vii. 22, 23 (one of those features, which prove the intimate acquaintance of the fourth evangelist with Jewish matters).

a woman at her delivery,[38] and it was laid down as a general principle, that all danger to life should supersede the Sabbath (כָּל־סָפֵק נְפָשׁוֹת דּוֹחֶה אֶת הַשַּׁבָּת).[39] "If a building falls upon any one, and it is doubtful whether he is under it or not, whether he is alive or dead, whether he is a non-Israelite or an Israelite, the ruins over him may be cleared away on the Sabbath. If he is found alive, they may be cleared farther; if he is dead, they must be left."[40] A physician may attend a patient if he is in danger. R. Matthijah ben Charash even allowed that a remedy might on the Sabbath be put into the mouth of any one feeling pain in the throat, because it might be dangerous.[41] This is however cited as only the opinion of this scholar, and by no means as holding good in general. At any rate medical assistance was only allowed on the assumption that life was in danger. "A fracture (of a limb) may not be attended to. If any one has sprained his hand or foot, he may not pour cold water on it."[42] "A priest officiating in the temple may, on the Sabbath, put on again the plaister which he took off during his ministration; otherwise this may not be done; a plaister may not be put on for the first time on the Sabbath. . . . If a priest hurts his finger, he may on the Sabbath bind it with rushes for service in the sanctuary, otherwise this is not allowed; for the pressing out of the blood, it is everywhere forbidden."[43] It quite agrees with this, that the enmity of the Pharisees should have been excited against Jesus on account of His cures on the Sabbath (Matt. xii. 9–13; Mark iii. 1–5; Luke vi. 6–10, xiii. 10–17, xiv. 1–6; John v. 1–16, ix. 14–16).[44] Even

[38] *Shabbath* xviii. 3.

[39] *Joma* viii. 6. Comp. also the passage from Synesius in Winer, *RWB.* ii. 345.

[40] *Joma* viii. 7. [41] *Joma* viii. 6. [42] *Shabbath* xxii. 6.

[43] *Erubin* x. 13–14. Comp. also *Edujoth* ii. 5.

[44] The Rabbinic material has been treated of from a one-sided and distorted point of view in Danz, *Christi curatio sabbathica vindicata ex legibus*

the principle, that danger to life should supersede the Sabbath, was by no means regarded as at all times decisive. At the beginning of the Maccabaean rising a troup of legalists let themselves perish to the last man, rather than have recourse to the sword on the Sabbath.[45] From that time forward it was determined to take up the sword for defence, but not for attack upon the Sabbath.[46] And this principle was on the whole adhered to.[47] But use was made of it only in cases of extreme necessity. And it often happened even in later times, that hostile generals were able to make use of the Jewish Sabbath to the disadvantage of the Jews.[48] How strictly the observance of the Sabbath was universally adhered to by Jewish soldiers, appears from the fact, that a man like Josephus regards it as a thing self-evident,[49] and that the Romans even found themselves obliged to release the Jews entirely from military service, because Jewish Sabbatarianism and Roman discipline were irreconcilable contrasts.[50]

*Judaicis* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 569–614). Zipser in Fürst's *Literaturblatt des Orients*, 1847, p. 814 sqq.; Jahrg. 1848, pp. 61 sqq., 197 sqq. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien aus Talmud und Midrash* (1878), pp. 150–152. Comp. also Winer, *RWB.* ii. 346. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xiii. 202 (1st ed.). On cattle which falls into a pit on a holy day, see *Beza* iii. 4.

[45] 1 Macc. ii. 34–38. Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 6. 2.

[46] 1 Macc. ii. 39–42. Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 6. 2.

[47] Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 1–3, xiv. 4. 2, xviii. 9. 2. That to fight on the Sabbath was considered as "forbidden in after times also" (Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 96, note), is not so universally correct. Josephus expressly says, that the law allowed the repulse of a personal attack (*Antt.* xiv. 4. 2).

[48] *Antt.* xiii. 12. 1, xiv. 4. 2. Comp. also Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 22, *s. fin.* (Ptolemy I. Lagos took Jerusalem on a Sabbath). *Book of Jubilees*, c. 50 (Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 70).

[49] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 21. 8 = *Vita*, 32.

[50] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11, 12, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19. Under the Ptolemies the Jews still took military service (*Antt.* xii. 1 and 2. 4, according to "Pseudo-Aristeas" in Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107. Merx' *Archiv*, i. 260). Comp. also *Antt.* xi. 8. 5, *fin.*, xiv. 8. 1.

## III.

Far deeper was the influence upon daily life of the manifold and far-reaching ordinances concerning *cleanness and uncleanness* and the removal of the latter,[51] than that of the law of the Sabbath. The Old Testament (Lev. xi.–xv.; Num. v. 1–4, and especially chap. xix.) had already given tolerably numerous and stringent precepts on these points, by declaring (for what reasons may be left undiscussed) first certain incidents of sexual life, then certain appearances on persons and objects comprised under the joint term of leprosy, and lastly, the corpses of both men and animals, as unclean and imparting uncleanness. It also gives detailed prescriptions concerning purification by sacrifices or lustrations, which are of very different kinds according to the kind and degree of uncleanness. But ample as were these enactments, they are still but poor and scanty compared with the abundance stored in the Mishna. No less than twelve treatises (filling the whole of the last part of the Mishna) deal with the matters appertaining to this subject. The enumeration of the "chief kinds of uncleanness" (אָבוֹת הַטֻּמְאוֹת), which it must be owned are for the most part based on the enactments of the Pentateuch (Lev. xi.–xv.), form the foundation of all these discussions. On this foundation however is raised an enormous and very complicated structure. For with each of the chief kinds the question has again to be dealt with: under what circumstances such uncleanness is incurred, in what manner and to what extent it is transferred to others, what utensils and

[51] Comp. generally, Winer, *RWB.* ii. 313–319 (art. "Reinigkeit"). Leyrer, art. "Reinigungen," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. pp. 620–640. Keil, *Bibl. Archäologie* (2nd ed. 1875), pp. 295–323. Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 459–476. Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 65–73. Kamphausen in Riehm's *Wörterb.* p. 1274 sqq. König in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xii. 617–637.

objects are and what are not capable of contracting uncleanness, and lastly, what means and regulations are required for its removal. To give at least a notion to what an extensive branch of knowledge this doctrine of uncleanness had been developed, some of the enactments concerning the utensils, which do and which do not contract uncleanness and by contact propagate it, are here given. The Old Testament basis is in Num. xix. 14, 15 and xxxi. 20–24.

A main question is first of all concerning the material of which the utensils are composed, and next concerning their form: whether they are hollow or flat. With respect to hollow *earthen vessels*, it is determined that the air in them contracts and propagates uncleanness, as does also the hollow of the foot, but not their outer side. Their purification can only result from their being broken.[52] But how far must the breaking go to effect purification? To this question too we receive an exact answer. A fraction is still esteemed a vessel (and therefore susceptible of defilement) "if, of a vessel holding a log, so much is left as to be able to hold enough to anoint the little toe with; and if, of a vessel holding from a log to a seah, space for a quarter of a log, from one to two seahs space for half a log; and from two or three seahs to five, space for a log is left."[53] While then hollow earthen vessels are not susceptible of defilement outside, though they are so within, the following earthen vessels contract no uncleanness at all: a flat plate without a rim, an open coal-shovel, a gridiron with holes in it for grains of wheat, brick gutters, although they are bent and have a hollow, and others besides.[54] The following are, on the contrary, capable of defilement: a plate with a rim, a whole coal-shovel, a plate full of bowl-like receptacles, an earthen spice-box or a writing apparatus with several receptacles.[55] Of *wooden*, *leathern*,

[52] *Kelim* ii. 1.
[53] *Kelim* ii. 2.
[54] *Kelim* ii. 3.
[55] *Kelim* ii. 7.

*bone and glass vessels*, the flat ones are also insusceptible of defilement; the deep ones, on the contrary, not only like the earthen ones, contract defilement in their atmosphere, but also on the outside. If they break, they are clean. If utensils are again made of them, they are again susceptible of defilement.[56] Here too arises again the difficult question: When are they to be accounted broken? "In all vessels for domestic purposes the measure (of a hole producing cleanness) is a pomegranate. R. Elieser says: The measure depends upon the use of the utensil."[57] "The pomegranate appointed as a measure is one not too large, but of a medium size."[58] "If a foot is wanting to a chest, a trunk or a press, it is clean, although capable of holding things. R. Joses considers all these as susceptible of defilement if, though not in proper repair, they are capable of holding the measure."[59] "A (three-footed) table, to which one foot is wanting, is clean, so is it if a second foot is gone, but if the third is also gone and it is to be used as a flat board, it is susceptible of defilement."[60] "A seat of which one side plank is missing is clean, so is it although a second is missing. If a hand-breadth in height is left it is capable of defilement."[61] Moreover in hollow utensils not only are the inside and outside, but also the "place for laying hold," to be distinguished. "If *e.g.* the hands are clean and the outside of the cup unclean, and the cup is held at the part which serves for holding, one need not be anxious lest the hands should be defiled by the outside of the cup."[62] "Of *metal vessels* the smooth and the hollow are capable of defilement. If they are broken, they are clean; if vessels are again made out of them they are in their former uncleanness."[63] "Every metal

[56] *Kelim* ii. 1, xv. 1.
[57] *Kelim* xvii. 1.
[58] *Kelim* xvii. 4–5.
[59] *Kelim* xviii. 3.
[60] *Kelim* xxii. 2.
[61] *Kelim* xx. 3.
[62] *Kelim* xxv. 7, 8.
[63] *Kelim* xi. 1.

vessel, which has a special name of its own, is capable of defilement; except a door, the bolt, the lock, the hinge-socket, the hinge, the knocker and a gutter; because they are fastened to the ground." [64] "In a bridle, the bit is capable of defilement, the plates on the cheeks are clean; according to R. Akiba, unclean. The learned say: only the bit is unclean, but the plates, only when they are fastened to it." [65] "Round horns (for blowing) are susceptible of defilement, straight ones are clean. If the mouthpiece is of metal, it is capable of defilement." [66] "Wood used on metal utensils is capable of defilement, metal used on wooden ones is clean. *E.g.* a wooden key with metal teeth is capable of defilement, even if the tooth is of only one piece. But if the key is of metal and the tooth of wood, it is not capable of defilement." [67]

The enactments concerning the removal of defilement by sacrifices and lustrations form a fit pendant to those concerning defilement. We will here quote a few of the latter. The main question in this matter is, as to what water is adapted to the different kinds of purification: to the sprinkling of the hands, the washing of utensils, the bath of purification for persons. The Mishna distinguishes six gradations of water reservoirs: 1. A pond and the water in ditches, cisterns or pits, also spring water no longer flowing, and collected water to the amount of less than forty seahs. All this, so far as it has not been defiled, is adapted for (the preparation of) Challa,[68] and for legal washing of the hands. 2. Spring water still running. This may be used for the heave (Terumah) and for the washing of the hands. 3. Collected water which amounts to forty seah. In this one may plunge oneself (take a bath of purification) and utensils. 4. A spring with little water, into which more drawn water has been poured. It resembles the

[64] *Kelim* xi. 2.
[65] *Kelim* xi. 5.
[66] *Kelim* xi. 7.
[67] *Kelim* xiii. 6.
[68] The heave offering of dough, which must be separated at baking.

former by purifying as a plunging bath in the place where it is collected (*i.e.* without running), and clean spring water, in that vessels are purified in it although there is but little of it. 5. Running water in which a change has taken place (*i.e.* water arising from mineral or warm springs). This purifies in running. 6. Clean spring water. This serves as a plunging-bath for running sores, for the sprinkling of lepers, and is suitable for sanctifying with ashes of purification.[69] These general maxims then form the foundation of a casuistry, which here again loses itself in endless detail. The Mishna especially launches forth in wearying diffuseness on what conditions and prerequisites the "collected water" mentioned in No. 3 (*i.e.* such rain, spring or river water as is not drawn, but conducted directly through gutters or pipes into a receptacle) is fit for bathing and for plunging of utensils, for which purpose the chief matter is that no "drawn water" should be mingled with it. We give a few examples by way of illustration. "R. Elieser says: A quarter of a log of drawn water, to begin with, makes the water, which afterwards falls into it, unfit for a plunging bath; but three logs of drawn water, if there was already other water there. The learned say: three logs, whether at the beginning or to make up the quantity."[70] "If any one places vessels under the pipes (which run into the plunging bath), they make the bath unsuitable (because it then counts as drawn water). According to the school of Shammai it is all the same, whether they have been placed there or forgotten; according to the school of Hillel, they do not make it unfit, if they were only forgotten."[71] "If drawn water and rain water are mixed in the court, or in the excavation, or upon the steps of the bathing-place, the bath is fit, if there is most of the fit water, and unfit, if there is most of the unfit, or if there is an equal quantity of both. But only so, if they were mixed before they arrived at the collected water.

[69] *Mikwaoth* i. 1–8. [70] *Mikwaoth* ii. 1. [71] *Mikwaoth* iv. 1.

If both run into the bath, then if it is certain that there were in it forty seahs of proper water before three logs of drawn water fell into it, it is fit, but otherwise unfit."[72] It was also disputed, whether snow, hail, hoar frost, ice and the like were fit to mix in the filling of a plunging bath or not.[73] Extremely minute too are the directions concerning the *washing* or correct *pouring upon* the hands. It was needful that the hands should always have water poured on them before eating. (To dip them in water was only necessary for eating holy things, *i.e.* things pertaining to sacrifices.) Then it was fully discussed, from what vessels such pouring should take place, what water was suitable for it, who might pour it, and how far the hands must be poured on.[74] We see with what zeal all these enactments concerning the washing of hands and the cleansing of cups, pots, dishes and seats were already observed in the time of Christ, from repeated allusions in the Gospels, which again receive their full light and aptest illustration through the details of the Mishna (Matt. xv. 2; Mark vii. 2–5; Matt. xxiii. 25, 26; Luke xi. 38, 39).

## IV.

From what has been stated it is abundantly evident, what enormous importance was everywhere attributed to external correctness of action, which is indeed a self-evident result, when once moral obligations are regarded in a legal manner. Highly characteristic of this strong tendency to externalism are *the three mementoes,* by which every Israelite, who is faithful to the law, is to be constantly reminded of his duties towards God. These three mementoes are: 1. The Zizith (צִיצִית,

[72] *Mikwaoth* iv. 4. [73] *Mikwaoth* vii. 1.

[74] *Berachoth* viii. 2–4; *Chagiga* ii. 5–6; *Edujoth* iii. 2; *Jadajim* i. 1–5, ii. 3. Lightfoot and other expositors on Matt. xv. 2. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien* (1878), p. 180 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc*, art. "Händewaschen."

plur. צִיצִיּוֹת), κράσπεδα in the LXX. and in the New Testament, כרוספדין in the Targum Onkelos, and τὸ κόκκινον ῥάμμα in Justin Martyr,[75] tassels or fringes of hyacinth blue or white wool, which every Israelite, by reason of the prescription, Num. xv. 37 sqq., Deut. xxii. 12, had to wear at the four corners of his upper garment. They were to be used, as it is said in the passage first quoted, "that ye may look upon them and remember all the commandments of the Lord and do them."[76] 2. The Mesusa (מְזוּזָה), an oblong box, fixed to house and room doors above the right hand door-post, on which was written (according to the direction, Deut. vi. 9, xi. 20), in twenty-two lines, the two paragraphs, Deut. vi. 4–9 and xi. 13–21.[77] 3. The *Tephillin* or prayer-straps, which every

[75] Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 46, *s. fin.* (ed. Otto, ii. 154). The editions have indeed τὸ κόκκινον βάμμα (colour), which gives no sense. That the true reading is ῥάμμα is evident from Hesychius, *Lex. s.v.* κράσπεδα· τὰ ἐν τῷ ἄκρῳ τοῦ ἱματίου κεκλωσμένα ῥάμματα καὶ τὸ ἄκρον αὐτοῦ.

[76] Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 281. 13 sq.; Matt. ix. 20, xiv. 36, xxiii. 5; Mark vi. 56; Luke viii. 44. The LXX. and *Targum Onkelos* on Num. xv. 38 and Deut. xxii. 12. Mishna, *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Edujoth* iv. 10; *Menachoth* iii. 7, iv. 1. The Rabbinical directions are brought together in an edition of the treatise Zizith by Raphael Kirchheim (*Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani*, ed. Raph. Kirchheim, 1851). Hiller, *De vestibus fimbriatis Hebraeorum* (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, vol. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 160–170; *Lex. Chald.* col. 1908 sq. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 197 sqq. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 9–14. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 322. Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Saum." Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 592–594. Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge zur Erläuterung der Evangelien*, pp. 274 f., 378. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, pp. 26–28. Riehm's *Wörterb.*, art. "Läpplein." The colour of the Zizith is now white, while originally it was to be of hyacinth blue. The Mishna, *Menachoth* iv. 1, already presupposes that both are allowed. They are also not now worn, as the Pentateuch directs, and as was still the custom in the time of Christ, on the upper garment (טַלִּית, ἱμάτιον), but on the two square woollen shawls, one of which is always worn on the body, while the other is only wound round the head during prayer. Both these shawls are also called Tallith.

[77] Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Mor. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 281. 15 sqq. Josephus, *Antt.* iv. 8. 13. Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 3; *Shabbath* viii. 3;

male Israelite had to put on at morning prayer (except on Sabbaths and holy days), in the Old Testament טוֹטָפוֹת (frontlets and bracelets), in Rabbinic Hebr. תְּפִלִּין (from תְּפִלָּה, prayer), in the New Testament *φυλακτήρια* (preservatives, amulets), incorrectly translated "Denkzettel" (memorandum) by Luther. Their use is founded upon the passages Ex. xiii. 9, 16; Deut. vi. 8, xi. 18. There were two of them: (*a*) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל יָד (Tephilla for the hand) or תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל זְרוֹעַ (Tephilla for the arm),[78] a small dice-shaped hollow parchment case, in which lay a small roll of parchment, on which were written the passages Ex. xiii. 1–10, xiii. 11–16; Deut. vi. 4–9, xi. 13–21. It was fastened by means of a strap drawn through it to the upper part of the left arm. (*b*) The תְּפִלָּה שֶׁל רֹאשׁ (Tephilla for the head), a case of the same kind, but differing from the former by being divided into four compartments, holding *four* little rolls of parchment, on which were the above-named passages from the Bible. It was fastened by means of a strap to the forehead just below the hair.[79] Of these three mementoes the first is

*Megilla* i. 8; *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Gittin* iv. 6; *Menachoth* iii. 7; *Kelim* xvi. 7, xvii. 16. The Rabbinical directions are put together in the treatise *Mesusa* (edited by Kirchheim in the above-named collection). Dassovius, *De ritibus Mezuzae* (Ugolini, *Thesaurus*, t. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 581–587; *Lex. Chald.* col. 654. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 19–24. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 19 sq. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xi. 642 (2nd ed. xi. 668). Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 595–598. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Mesusa."

[78] The former *e.g. Menachoth* iv. 1; the latter *Mikwaoth* x. 3.

[79] Comp. Pseudo-Aristeas, ed. Schmidt in Merx' *Archiv*, i. 281. 18 sqq.; Matt. xxiii. 5. Joseph. *Antt.* iv. 8. 13. Justinus Martyr, *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 46, *s. fin.* (ed. Otto, ii. 154). Origen on Matt. xxiii. 5 (ed. Lommatzsch, iv. 201); the patristic expositors in general, on Matt. xxiii. 5. Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 1, 3; *Shabbath* vi. 2, viii. 3, xvi. 1; *Erubin* x. 1–2; *Shekalim* iii. 2; *Megilla* i. 8, iv. 8; *Moed Katan* iii. 4; *Nedarim* ii. 2; *Gittin* iv. 6; *Sanhedrin* xi. 3; *Shebuoth* iii. 8–11; *Menachoth* iii. 7, iv. 1; *Arachin* vi. 3, 4; *Kelim* xvi. 7, xviii. 8, xxiii. 1; *Mikwaoth* x. 2, 3, 4; *Jadajim* iii. 3. Targum Onkelos on Ex. xiii. 16; Deut. vi. 8. Pseudo-Jonathan on Ex. xxxix. 31; Deut. xi. 18. Targum on the Song of Solomon viii. 3; on

at any rate founded on the directions of the Pentateuch, and probably the two others also, inasmuch as, at least in the passage of Deuteronomy, the literal interpretation is certainly the correct one (see Dillmann on Ex. xiii. 16). But the value which was set upon these externals, and the care with which everything was here ordered down to the smallest detail, is quite characteristic of later Judaism. How many threads the Zizith were to consist of, how long they were to be, how many knots were to be tied in them, and in what manner these were to be made, how the paragraphs of the Mesusa and Tephillin were to be written, how large the cases and how long the straps of the latter were to be, how they were to be fastened to the head and arm, and how often the straps should be bound round the latter: all this was settled with the most anxious care. There was almost as great reverence for the Tephillin as for the Scriptures.[80] It was permitted to rescue the former as well as the latter from a fire even on the Sabbath.[81] The Tephillin and Mesusa were held in such

Esther viii. 16. Babylon. Talmud, *Shabbath* 28b, 62a; *Erubin* 95b to 97a; *Megilla* 24b; *Menachoth* 34b to 37a, 42b to 44b. (The passages from the Targum and Talmud after Pinner.) The treatise *Tefillin* (edited by Kirchheim) gives a collection of Rabbinical prescriptions. Ugolini, *De Phylacteriis Hebraeorum* (*Thesaurus*, tom. xxi.). Buxtorf, *Synagoga Judaica*, pp. 170–185; *Lex. Chald.* col. 1743 sq. Spencer, *De natura et origine Phylacteriorum* (in *De legibus Hebraeorum ritualibus*, ed. Tübing. 1732, pp. 1201–1232). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 190–197. Bodenschatz, *Kirchl. Verfassung der heutigen Juden*, iv. 14–19. Lightfoot on Matt. xxiii. 5. Wolf, *Curae phil.*, and other expositors on Matt. xxiii. 5. Hartmann, *Die enge Verbindung des Alten Test. mit dem Neuen*, pp. 360–362. Winer, *RWB.* ii. 260 sq. (art. "Phylakterien"). Pinner, *Uebersetzung des Tractates Berachoth*, fol. 6a, Explanation 33. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 223–225. Leyrer, art. "Phylakterien," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xi. 639–643 (2nd ed. xi. 666–669). Haneberg, *Relig. Alterthümer*, pp. 587–592. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* ii. 549 sq. Delitzsch, art. "Denkzettel," in Riehm's *Wörterb.* (with illustrations). Klein, *Die Totaphoth nach Bibel und Tradition* (*Jahrbb. f. prot. Theol.* 1881, pp. 666–689). Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Tephillin."

[80] *Jadajim* iii. 3.

[81] *Shabbath* xvi. 1.

superstitious estimation that they were looked upon as preservatives against demoniacal powers, as is evident in the case of the former from the name *φυλακτήρια*.

Such external formalism is, as all can see, very far removed from true piety. The latter certainly might even under such a burden still continue to maintain a bare existence; but when besides this even *prayer* itself, that centre of the religious life, was bound in the fetters of a rigid mechanism, vital piety could scarcely be any longer spoken of. This fatal step had also been already taken by Judaism in the time of Christ. The two chief prayers then always customary for private use are: (1) the Shema, which was to be recited twice a day, not a prayer properly speaking, but a confession of the God of Israel; and (2) the Shemoneh Esreh, the usual daily prayer, which was to be said morning, noon and evening (particulars § 27, Appendix). These prayers too were now made the subjects of casuistic discussions, and their use was thereby degraded to an external function.[82] This applies especially to the Shema, to which we may here the more confine ourselves, in that it is questionable, whether the Shemoneh Esreh had in the time of Christ already attained a settled form. First of all, the period of time within which the evening and morning Shema were to be said had to be exactly determined. The point of commencement for the former was the time "when the priests return to eat their Terumah (Heave);" the point of conclusion, according to R. Elieser, the end of the first night-watch; according to the usual view, midnight; according to R. Gamaliel, the appearance of dawn.[83] The morning Shema may be said "as soon as one can distinguish between blue and white. R. Elieser says: between blue and leek-green." It may be said "till

[82] Comp. also Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, pp. 40–42.

[83] *Berachoth* i. 1.

the sun appears. R. Joshua says till three o'clock (nine according to our reckoning), for it is the custom of the children of princes not to rise till three."[84] The Shema, consisting chiefly of paragraphs from the Bible, the question next arose, whether any one, who at the time for saying the Shema is reading the Bible, and reads the paragraphs in question in the midst of their context, has sufficiently done his Shema duty or not. To this it is answered: If he thought of it (אִם כִּוֵּן לִבּוֹ), he has sufficiently done it; but not otherwise.[85] It is very characteristic, and a confirmation of the saying of Christ (Matt. vi. 5) concerning praying in the streets, that the question is also discussed, whether and under what circumstances salutations may be made while praying the Shema. Three cases came under consideration: (1) Salutations from fear (מִפְּנֵי הַיִּרְאָה); (2) salutations from reverence (מִפְּנֵי הַכָּבוֹד); and (3) salutations of every one (לְכָל אָדָם); besides which a salutation and a response to a salutation were to be distinguished; and lastly, it was to be considered, that there were in the Shema itself natural breaks, viz. between the first and second Berachah, betwen the latter and the paragraph Deut. xi. 13–21, and between that and the paragraph Num. xv. 37–41, and lastly between that and the final Berachah. R. Meir therefore allowed that at the breaks the salutation from reverence might be made and returned, but that in the middle only the salutation from fear might be given and returned. R. Jehudah however went a step farther, and allowed also to return the salutation of reverence in the middle, and at the breaks to return the salutation of every one.[86] The following general directions were given: "He who prays the Shema, without making it audible to his ear, has performed his duty. R. Joses says: He has not performed it. He who prays and has not exactly noticed the letters has, according to R. Joses, satisfied his duty; but according to R. Jehudah he has not.

[84] *Berachoth* i. 2. [85] *Berachoth* ii. 1. [86] *Berachoth* ii. 1–2.

He who prays in a wrong order has not done his duty. He who makes a mistake must begin again where he made the mistake. Workmen may pray in a tree or upon the wall." [87]

It was a good custom, *that food and drink should* (according to the precept Deut. viii. 10) *never be partaken of without thanksgiving to God.* Grace (Berachoth) was said both before and after meals, and also by women, slaves and children.[88] But here too regulations were made down to the pettiest detail: viz. what form was to be used for the fruits of the trees, what for wine, what for the fruits of the ground, for bread, for vegetables, for vinegar, for unripe fallen fruit, for locusts, milk, cheese, eggs; and scholars contended as to when this and when that form was suitable.[89] "If a blessing has been spoken on wine before the meal, the wine after the meal is exempt." "If the blessing has been pronounced over a side-dish before the meal, the side-dish after the meal is exempt. If the blessing has been said over the bread, the side-dish is exempt." [90] "If salted food is set before any one first and bread afterwards, the blessing is to be spoken over the salted food and the bread exempted." [91] "If any one has eaten figs, grapes and pomegranates, he is to say three blessings afterwards. This is the opinion of R. Gamaliel. The learned say: one blessing of threefold purport." [92] "For how much food is formal preparation for thanksgiving requisite? For food the size of an olive. R. Jehudah says: of an egg." [93] "If any one has eaten and forgotten to say grace, he must, according to the school of

[87] *Berachoth* ii. 3–4.

[88] *Berachoth* iii. 3–4. It is well known, that grace at meals was also a custom with Christians from the very first (Rom. xiv. 6; 1 Cor. x. 30; 1 Tim. iv. 4), as indeed Jesus Himself always practised this usage (Matt. xiv. 19, xv. 36, xxvi. 26, and parallel passages). See in general, Winer, *RWB.* i. 398. Arnold, art. "Mahlzeiten der Hebräer," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* viii. 6. 88 (2nd ed. ix. 202).

[89] *Berachoth* vi. 1–3.

[90] *Berachoth* vi. 5.

[91] *Berachoth* vi. 7.

[92] *Berachoth* vi. 8.

[93] *Berachoth* vii. 2.

Shammai, return to his place and say grace; the school of Hillel allows him to say it where he remembers it. How long does the obligation to say grace last? Till the food is digested."[94]

When such restriction was laid upon prayer by the legal formula, it could not but be chilled into an external performance. Of what avail was it that the prayers themselves were beautiful and copious (as must be admitted especially of the Shemoneh Esreh), if they were nevertheless only said for the sake of "fulfilling a duty"? Of what avail was it for R. Elieser to declare, that "he who makes his prayer an appointed duty (קְבַע), his prayer is no devout supplication,"[95] when he himself contributed to make it the former? If a legalistic treatment of the moral life in general is an evil, it is twice and thrice such in the case of prayer, that tenderest blossom of the inmost heart. It was only the necessary result of such a mode of treatment, that men sank so low as to degrade prayer to the service of vanity (Matt. vi. 5), and to misuse it as a covering of inward impurity (Matt. xv. 7 sq.; Mark vii. 6, xii. 40; Luke xx. 47).

A further point, in which the utter externalism of the religious life comes to light, is that of *fasting*. That the Pharisees fasted often, and set great value upon this act, we learn in a general manner from the Gospels (Matt. ix. 14; Mark ii. 18; Luke v. 33). Particulars as to the kind and manner of fasting are found in the Mishna, whose details are again confirmed by the Gospels. Public or general fasts (which were ordered especially on the failure of rain in autumn, and at all times of public misfortune) were always delayed till the second and fifth days of the week (Monday and Thursday), and so that they always began on the second. Thus a three days' fast would fall upon the second, fifth and second (Monday, Thursday, Monday), and a six days' fast would then continue on the fifth, second and fifth, etc.[96]

[94] *Berachoth* viii. 7. [95] *Berachoth* iv. 4. Comp. *Aboth* ii. 13.
[96] *Taanith* ii. 9. Comp. Διδαχὴ τῶν δώδεκα ἀποστόλων (ed. Bryennios,

Besides these general and appointed fasts, to which every one had to submit, there was also much voluntary fasting, and the strictest went so far as to fast on the two above-named week-days all the year round.[97] The external behaviour differed according to the strictness of the fast. In the slighter kind they used still to wash and anoint themselves; in the stricter both were omitted; and in the strictest of all, every kind of pleasant transaction, even mutual greetings, were abstained from.[98] It was generally preferred to practise fasting in the most public manner possible, and thus to make a show of pious zeal. But the worst was the fundamental view, from which all this proceeded. It was thought by such self-infliction to put a pressure upon God, and as it were to extort favours from Him if He withheld them. The longer the rain was delayed in autumn, the stricter did the fasting become. If the 17th Marcheshvan came before the rain fell, individuals began to hold fasts of three days. If the new moon of Chisleu appeared without rain having fallen, three general fasts were ordered. If after these had taken place no rain had fallen, three more fast days, and indeed with certain severities, were ordered. If these passed by without rain,

1883), c. 8: Αἱ δὲ νηστεῖαι ὑμῶν μὴ ἔστωσαν μετὰ τῶν ὑποκριτῶν· νηστεύουσι γὰρ δευτέρᾳ σαββάτων καὶ πέμπτῃ· ὑμεῖς δὲ νηστεύσατε τετράδα καὶ παρασκευήν. The same almost literally in *Const. apost.* vii. 23. Epiphan. *haer.* xvi. 1 (ed. Petav. p. 34): ἐνήστευον δὶς τοῦ σαββάτου, δευτέραν καὶ πέμπτην. *Josephi Hypomnesticum*, c. 145 (in Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* vol. ii. Appendix).

97 Ev. Luc. xviii. 12; comp. *Taanith fol.* 12a (in Lightfoot and Wetzstein on Luke xviii. 12): יחיד שקיבל עליו שני וחמישי ושני של כל שנה. "An individual who takes it upon himself on the second, fifth, and second days *during the whole year*," etc. The widely-spread opinion, that all the Pharisees observed the two fast days during the whole year is, according to this, incorrect.

98 *Taanith* i. 4–7; in all points confirmed by Matt. vi. 16–18 (where the figurative construction of the direction given by Jesus is not, as Meyer thinks, self-evident, but utterly preposterous. Jesus meant to say that fasting should not be shown externally, and therefore the usual washing and anointing not omitted). Comp. also *Joma* viii. 1.

seven general fast days were prescribed, again with fresh severities.[99]

## V.

The examples brought forward will have made sufficiently evident the manner in which the moral and religious life was conceived of and regulated from the juristic point of view. In all questions everything depended only upon settling what was according to law, and that with the utmost possible care, that so the acting subject might have certain directions for every individual case. In a word: ethic and theology were swallowed up in jurisprudence. The evil results of this external view on practical matters are very evident. And such results were its necessary consequence. Even in that most favourable case of juristic casuistry moving on the whole in morally correct paths, it was in itself a poisoning of the moral principle, and could not but have a paralysing and benumbing effect upon the vigorous pulsation of the moral life. But this favourable case by no means occurred. When once the question was started: "What have I to do to fulfil the law?" the temptation was obvious, that a composition with the letter would be chiefly aimed at, at the cost of the real demands of morality, nay of the proper intention of the law itself.

A tolerably harmless, and in its harmlessness a ludicrous example of the manner in which elaborate ingenuity may find ways and means of at once evading the law and yet fulfilling it, is given by the appointments concerning the so-called *Erubh*. It was, as we know, forbidden among other things to carry on the Sabbath an object out of one tenement (רְשׁוּת) into another. This had the inconvenient effect of preventing almost all freedom of movement on the Sabbath, for the term רְשׁוּת (or more exactly רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד), the private tenement or dwelling, was

[99] *Taanith* i. 4–6.

a very narrow one. If however this term could be enlarged, and the largest possible tenements instituted, the evil would happily be remedied. The first means adopted for the attainment of this object was the so-called commixture or connection of courts (עֵרוּב חֲצֵרוֹת), *i.e.* the connection of several houses standing in one court (each of which forms a רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד) into one רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד. Such a connection was effected by all the inhabitants collecting a certain amount of food before a Sabbath or holy day and placing it in an appointed place, thus showing that they regarded the whole court, with all the dwellings in it, as a common whole. By this contrivance it became lawful to the joint inhabitants to carry in and out within this רְשׁוּת on a holy day.[100] Of course it was now settled with great conscientiousness, what kind of food might be used for this *Erubh*, and how much food was necessary, and what particulars were to be observed, as may be read at length in the Mishna.[101] Not very much however was obtained by this connection of courts. Hence another means supplementary of the former and far more prolific was hit upon, viz. the "connection of entrances" (עֵרוּב פָּתוֹת), *i.e.* the shutting off of a narrow court or of a space enclosed on three sides by a cross beam, a rope or a string, by which these became רְשׁוּת הַיָּחִיד, and thus spaces within which carrying in and out was allowed. In this case also it was very anxiously debated, how high and how broad the openings, the shutting up of which was in question, must be, and of what kind must be the means of closure, the beams, ropes, etc., how thick, how wide, etc.[102]

Besides the carrying of things from one tenement to another, walking a distance of more than 2000 cubits on the Sabbath was also forbidden. For this too a means of mitigation was devised by the "connection of boundaries" (עֵרוּב תְּחוּמִין). That is, he who desired to go farther than 2000 cubits had only

[100] Jost's introduction to the treatise *Erubin*.
[101] *Erubin* vi.–vii. [102] *Erubin* i. 1 sqq., vii. 6 sqq.

before the beginning of the Sabbath to deposit somewhere within this limit, and therefore perhaps at its end, food for two meals. He thus declared, as it were, that here would be his place of abode, and he might then on the Sabbath go not merely from his actual to his legal abode, but also 2000 cubits from the latter.[103] Nay such particular preparation was not necessary in all cases. If *e.g.* any one should be on the road when the Sabbath began, and see at a distance of 2000 cubits a tree or a wall, he might declare it to be his Sabbath abode, and might then go not only 2000 cubits to the tree or wall, but also 2000 cubits farther. Only he must do the thing thoroughly, and say: "My Sabbath place shall be at its trunk" (שְׁבִיתָתִי בְעִקָּרוֹ). For if he said only: "My Sabbath place shall be under it" (שְׁבִיתָתִי תַחְתָּיו), this did not hold good, because it was too general and indefinite.[104]

Innocent as such trifling may be in itself, it nevertheless terribly shows, that the moral point of view was entirely superseded by the legal and formal one, that the effort was merely to do justice to the letter of the law, even though its meaning was evaded.

Such shifting of the right point of view necessarily led, in more important cases than those just touched upon, to results in direct opposition to a moral view of things. The woe pronounced by our Lord upon the scribes for lightly trifling with *the oath* by saying: "Whosoever shall swear by the temple, it is nothing; but whosoever shall swear by the gold of the temple, he is bound: and whosoever sweareth by the altar, it is nothing; but whosoever sweareth by the sacrifice that is on it, he is bound" (Matt. xxiii. 16–18), is well known.[105] So too is their lax interpretation of the injunction

[103] Jost's introduction to the treatise *Erubin*. More particular enactments, *Erubin* iii. iv. viii.

[104] *Erubin* iv. 7.

[105] Comp. *Shebuoth* iv. 13: He who swears "by heaven and earth," if he swears falsely, is not guilty of perjury. See in general, *Shebuoth* iv. 3 sqq.

concerning divorce, Deut. xxiv. 1: That a man might put away his wife if he had found anything shameful in her (עֶרְוַת דָּבָר). Only the school of Shammai left the words their proper meaning. The school of Hillel explained them away as: If she has even spoiled his food. And lastly, according to R. Akiba, a man was allowed to put away his wife if he had found another fairer than she was.[106] The laws of purification gave occasion for treating the sphere of the intercourse of the sexes in a manner very similar to the slippery casuistry of the Jesuits—a striking proof how the casuistic method, as such, leads by an inward necessity to such errors.[107] Another point too affords a striking parallel with Jesuitism, viz. the postponement of the duties of natural piety, *e.g.* towards a father or mother, to supposed religious obligations: "If a man shall say to his father or his mother, that whereby thou mightest have been profited by me is Corban, that is to say, given to God, you allow him to do no more for father or mother" (Mark vii. 11, 12; comp. Matt. xv. 5); it is thus that Jesus reproves the Pharisees, and in agreement with this we read in the Mishna, that a vow made cannot be revoked "on account of the honour due to parents" (בכבוד אבין ואמן).[108] Thus the religious obligation, in its external and formal sense, stands above the supreme duty of natural piety.

All this shows that the Lord had only too much reason for rebuking His contemporaries for straining out a gnat and swallowing a camel (Matt. xxiii. 24), and for hurling in their

Maimonides also says that an oath by heaven and earth is no oath. See the passage in Lightfoot, *Horae hebr.* on Matt. v. 33 (*Opp.* ii. 293). Schöttgen, *Horae hebr.* i. 40.

[106] *Gittin* ix. 10. Comp. Matt. xix. 3. On these dilutions in general, see Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, ii. 248 sqq.

[107] Comp. the treatises *Nidda* and *Sabim*.

[108] *Nedarim* ix. 1 (only R. Elieser permits it, but he stands alone). Comp. also Wünsche, *Neue Beiträge*, pp. 184–186. All attempts to explain away the testimony of Jesus, agreeing as it does with the Mishna, are in vain, *e.g.* von Rosenberg in Delitzsch's *Saat und Hoffnung*, 1875, pp. 37–40.

faces the heavy accusation of making clean the outside of the cup and platter, but being within full of extortion and excess. Like whited sepulchres, which indeed appeared beautiful without, but within are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness, they also appeared righteous before men, but within were full of hypocrisy and iniquity (Matt. xxiii. 27, 28; Luke xi. 44). It would however be unjust to find in such words of rebuke, however well founded, a universal characteristic of the whole period. Justice requires us to mention, that many an excellent saying of the learned men of that age, affording proof, that all moral judgment was not stifled under the rubbish of Halachic discussions, has been preserved. We may recall perhaps the already mentioned exhortation of Antigonus of Socho, to be like servants, who do service without regard to reward,[109] or that of R. Elieser, not to make prayer a settled duty.[110] Hillel's motto was, judge not thy neighbour till thou come into his place.[111] R. Elieser ben Hyrkanos said: Let your neighbour's honour be as dear to you as your own.[112] R. Jose ha-Kohen said: Let your neighbour's property be as dear to you as your own. He also said: Do all your acts in the name of God.[113] R. Judah ben Tema said: Be bold as a leopard, light as an eagle, swift as a stag, and strong as a lion, to do the will of your Father in heaven.[114]

But when we look away from the single rays of light, and from the deeper shadows which form their contrast, we cannot better characterize the entire tendency of the Judaism of that period, than by the words of the apostle: "They have a zeal for God, but not according to knowledge. It was a fearful burden

[109] *Aboth* i. 3. [110] *Berachoth* iv. 4. Comp. *Aboth* ii. 13.
[111] *Aboth* ii. 4. [112] *Aboth* ii. 10. [113] *Aboth* ii. 12.
[114] *Aboth* v. 20. Comp. Saalschütz, *Archäologie der Hebräer*, i. 247 sqq. Weiss (*Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Tradition*, vol. i. 1871) has collected a number of Talmudic parallels to sayings of Christ, given also in German by Weber in Delitzsch's *Saat auf Hoffnung*, 1872, p. 89 sqq. So too has Duschak, *Die Moral der Evangelien und des Talmud*, Brünn 1877.

which a spurious legalism had laid upon the shoulders of the people. They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders" (Matt. xxiii. 4; Luke xi. 46). Nothing was left to free personality, everything was placed under the bondage of the letter. The Israelite, zealous for the law, was obliged at every impulse and movement to ask himself, what is commanded? At every step, at the work of his calling, at prayer, at meals, at home and abroad, from early morning till late in the evening, from youth to old age, the dead, the deadening formula followed him. A healthy moral life could not flourish under such a burden, action was nowhere the result of inward motive, all was, on the contrary, weighed and measured. Life was a continual torment to the earnest man, who felt at every moment that he was in danger of transgressing the law; and where so much depended on the external form, he was often left in uncertainty whether he had really fulfilled its requirements. On the other hand, pride and conceit were almost inevitable for one who had attained to mastership in the knowledge and treatment of the law. He could indeed say that he had done his duty, had neglected nothing, had fulfilled all righteousness. But all the more certain is it, that this righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees (Matt. v. 20), which looked down with proud thanks to God upon the sinner (Luke xviii. 9–14), and pompously displayed its works before the eyes of the world (Matt. vi. 2, xxiii. 5), was not that true righteousness which was well-pleasing to God.

## 29. THE MESSIANIC HOPE.

### The Literature.[1]

Schöttgen, *Horae Hebraicae et Talmudicae*, vol. ii. *De Messia*, 1742. (A work of eminent scholarship, but ruled by the effort to make the Rabbis into Christian theologians. Even the doctrine of the *communicatio idiomatum* is proved from Rabbinic works.)

Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum Jesu apostolorumque aetate in compendium redacta observationibusque illustrata.* Erlangae 1811.

Moraht, *De iis, quae ad cognoscendam Judaeorum Palaestinensium, qui Jesu tempore vivebant, Christologiam evangelia nobis exhibeant, deque locis messianis in illis allegatis.* Gotting. 1828.

De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik Alten und Neuen Testaments* (3rd ed. 1831), pp. 159–179. The same, *Commentatio de morte Jesu Christi expiatoria* (*Opuscula theologica*, 1830, pp. 1–148).

Von Cölln, *Biblische Theologie*, vol. i. (1836), pp. 479–511.

Mack, *Die messianischen Erwartungen und Ansichten der Zeitgenossen Jesu* (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1836, pp. 3–56, 193–226).

Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils* (also under the title, *Gesch. des Urchristenthums*, vols. i.–ii. 1838), ii. 195–444.

Bauer (Bruno), *Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte der Synoptiker*, vol. i. 1841, pp. 391–416.

Zeller, *On the Assertion that prae-Christian Judaism had no Messianic Dogmatic* (*Theol. Jahrb.* 1843, pp. 35-52).

Hellwag, Baur, and Zeller's *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, pp. 151–160 (in the article, On the notion of the pre-existence of Christ in the primitive Church).

Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwickelung.* Jena 1857.

Oehler, art. "Messias," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. ix. p. 408 sqq., 422–441. In the 2d ed. revised by Orelli, ix. 641 ff.

---

[1] See the older literature in Hase, *Leben Jesu*, § 34. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik* (3rd ed.), p. 163. Bretschneider, *Systematische Entwickelung aller in der Dogmatik vorkommenden Begriffe* (4th ed. 1841), p. 553 sqq.

Colani, *Jésus-Christ et les croyances messianiques de son temps*, 2nd ed. Strasbourg 1864, pp. 1–68.

Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina zur Zeit Christi.* Freiburg 1866, pp. 391–461.

Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. v. (3rd ed. 1867) pp. 135–160.

Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, vol. i. 1867, pp. 239–250.

Holtzman, *Die Messiasidee zur Zeit Jesu* (*Jahrbb. für deutsche Theol.* 1867, pp. 389–411). The same in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* (1867), ii. 191–211.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. i. (2nd ed. 1873) pp. 165–176.

Weiffenbach, *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit synopticorum sententia exponitur* (Gissae 1868), pp. 47–62.

Ebrard, *Wissenschaftl. Kritik der evangelischen Geschichte* (3rd ed. 1868), pp. 835–849.

Wittichen, *Die Idee des Reiches Gottes, dritter Beitrag zur biblischen Theologie insbesondere der synoptichen Reden Jesu* (Göttingen 1872), pp. 105–165.

Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der messianischen Idee*, edited by Krenkel (Berlin 1873), pp. 78–91.

Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, Firenze 1874 (p. 358).

Vernes, *Histoire des idées messianiques depuis Alexandre jusqu' à l'empereur Hadrien*, Paris 1874 (p. 294).

Stähelin, *Jahrb. für deutsch Theologie*, 1874, pp. 199–218 (in the article, *Zur paulinischen Eschatologie*).

Schönefeld, *Ueber die messianische Hoffnung von 200 vor Christo bis gegen 50 nach Christo*, Jena 1874.

Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah, a Critical History of the Messianic Idea among the Jews from the rise of the Maccabees to the closing of the Talmud*, London 1877 (p. 395).

Stapfer, *Les idées religieuses en Palestine à l'époque de Jésus-Christ* (2nd ed. 1878), pp. 111–132.

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie aus Targum, Midrasch und Talmud dargestellt* (Leipzig 1880), pp. 322–386.

Reuss, *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments* (1881), § 555, 556.

Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883), arts. "Messianische Leidenszeit," "Messias," "Messiasleiden," "Messias Sohn Joseph," "Messiaszeit" (pp. 735–779). Comp. also "Armilus," "Belebung der Todten," "Ewiges Leben," "Lohn und Strafe," "Paradies," "Vergeltung," "Zukunftsmahl."

Within the sphere of the religious ideas held by the Jewish people during the period with which we are occupied, two groups may be distinguished: (1) *General religious ideas*, with respect to the relation of man and of the world to God, and (2) *Specific Israelitish ideas*, which have for their object the relation of the Jewish people to Jahveh as the God of Israel. The latter are those which are the really prevailing ideas, they form the centre around which the others are grouped and to which they are related. These specific Israelitish ideas however received again their special tinge in later times from the legal view of the relation between Jahveh and Israel. The thought, that God had selected this one people for His possession and therefore bestowed His benefits upon them exclusively, was now supplemented by the other, that He had also given them a law, and thereby bound Himself to bestow His benefits under the presupposition, that they observed this law. Thus the maxim, *that God gave many commands and ordinances to the people of Israel for the purpose of providing them with much reward now formed the core of the religious consciousness.*[2] Very simple observation however showed, that this reward was in present experience bestowed neither upon the nation as a whole, nor upon individuals, in the proportion to be expected. The more intensely therefore the consciousness of the nation and the individual was penetrated by this thought, the more must their gaze have been directed to the future, and the worse the state of the present, the more ardent must that gaze have been. Hence we may say, that in later times *the religous consciousness was concentrated upon the hope of the future.* The better future to be expected was the special object towards which all other religious ideas teleologically referred. As the *work* of the Israelite was virtually the observance of the law, so was his *faith* virtually belief in a better future. Round

[2] *Makkoth* iii. 16.

these two poles (as we have already remarked, p. 93) did the religious life of the Jewish people revolve during our period. They were zealous for the law in order one day to obtain reward. This central position of the hope of the future in the religious consciousness of Israel justifies us in again specially directing our attention thereto.

### I. RELATION TO THE OLDER MESSIANIC HOPE.

The hope of a better future was already with the prophets of the Old Testament an essential element of their religious consciousness. Nor was it ever entirely lost by the people, though it was not always as lively as it again became in an increasing degree after the Maccabaean rising. In the course of time however this hope of the future experienced many changes. There was indeed far greater freedom of movement in the sphere of *faith* than in that of *action*. While legal precepts were binding to their very smallest details, and must therefore be handed down unaltered from one generation to another, comparatively freer play was permitted to faith, and provided certain fundamentals were adhered to, the individual need could here come forward more freely (see above, § 25. III. Halachah and Haggadah). Hence too the hope of the future was developed in very various manners. Still certain common *ground lines* may here be observed, *by which the later Messianic hope is on the average characteristically distinguished from the older*. The older Messianic hope virtually moves within the boundary of the then present circumstances of the world, and is nothing else than the hope of a better future for the *nation*. That the nation should be morally purified from all bad elements, that it should exist unmolested and respected in the midst of the Gentile world, whilst its enemies were either destroyed or forced to acknowledge the nation and

its God, that it should be governed by a just, wise and powerful king of the house of David, and that therefore internal justice, peace and happiness would prevail, nay that all natural evils would be abolished and a state of unclouded prosperity would appear—this may be said to have formed the foundation of the future hope among the older prophets. This picture however underwent very important alterations in the consciousness of a subsequent age, partly in the times of the later prophets, but especially in the post-canonical period.

1. And first, *the view became more and more extended from the nation to the world:* the eye was fixed not only on the future of the *nation*, but on the future of the *world*. While in the former vision the heathen nations were only objects of consideration, so far as they stood in some kind of relation to Israel, the expectation of after times fixed its gaze more and more decidedly upon the fate of all mankind, nay of the whole world. The *judgment* was originally a visitation by which either Israel was purified or its enemies destroyed; it subsequently became the judgment of the world, in which the fate of all men and all nations will be decided, and that either by God Himself or by His Anointed, the Messianic King of Israel. The ideal *kingdom* of the future does not, according to former expectation, extend beyond the actual limits of the Holy Land; according to the later view, the future kingdom of God comprises all mankind, who willingly or by compulsion are united under the sceptre of Israel into a universal monarchy. Thus the Messiah is the judge and ruler of the world. Nay even the irrational creation, heaven and earth, and therefore the whole universe in the strict sense, is transformed, the old destroyed and a new and glorious one made in its stead. This extension of the idea of the future was partly brought about by the extension of the political horizon. The more the small separate states

were absorbed by the great universal monarchies, the more obvious was it to view the ideal kingdom of the future also as a universal monarchy. After the overthrow of the last heathen universal monarchy God Himself assumes the sceptre and founds a universal kingdom, which He, the heavenly King, rules by means of His people. But still more important than the enlargement of the political horizon in the development of the Messianic idea, was the enlargement of the notion of God and of the view of the world in general. In the original view Jehovah is only the God and King of Israel. He is subseqently more and more decidedly and evidently regarded as the God and King of the world. With this again is connected the ever increasing hold upon the consciousness of the nation of "the world" as a single whole comprising all existence. The growing universalism of the expectation of the future was virtually conditioned by this enlargement of the religious consciousness in general.

2. With this enlargement of the future hope is combined however, on the other hand, *a far more decided reference of this hope to the individual.* This too is connected with the development of the religious consciousness in general. Originally Jehovah is the God of the nation, who directs with His mighty hand the woe or weal of the people. The lot of the individual was hardly thought of. But as the religious consciousness deepened, the individual could not but more and more feel himself the object of God's care. Each individual knew his fate to be in the hand of God, and was sure that God would not forsake him. The strengthening of this individual belief in providence gradually resulted in a more individual hope of the future. This was indeed comparatively very late, as it cannot be pointed to till the time of Daniel. The form in which it was first manifested was that of a *belief in the resurrection.* The pious Israelite being certain, that his personal and indeed his enduring and eternal

salvation is the will of God, expects, that he and all the godly will have a share in the future glory of the nation. He then who is seized by death before this is realized, may hope, that he will one day be raised up again by God and transplanted to the kingdom of His glory. According to this the object of the resurrection is a participation in the glorious future of the nation, and the basis of faith in the resurrection is the ever more powerfully developing interest of personal salvation. But not only did the interest of salvation take an individual form, but reflection was more and more directed to the future fate of the individual *in malam partem* also. God keeps in heaven an account of the deeds of each individual, at least of each Israelite. And decision will be given at the judgment on the ground of what is contained in these heavenly books, and reward or punishment meted to each exactly according to his merits. The result of this again was, that the expectation of a resurrection was now that of a general resurrection: not only were the righteous, but the unrighteous also to rise, to receive their sentence at the judgment. This expectation however never attained general acceptance, many looking only for a resurrection of the just. Lastly however the individual interest was no longer satisfied with a resurrection for the purpose of participation in the Messianic kingdom. This was no longer regarded as the ultimate and supreme felicity, but a higher, an eternal, a heavenly happiness expected afterwards, even an absolutely glorious state in heaven; as on the other hand for the wicked, not merely an exclusion from Messiah's kingdom, but eternal torment and punishment in hell.

3. These last particulars are already connected with a further peculiarity, by which the hope of the future entertained in later, is distinguished from that of older times; for it had now become *more and more transcendent*, and was more and more transferred to the supernatural and supermundane.

The older hope kept within the range of present circumstances. A destruction of the enemies of Israel, a purification of the people and their glorious future, were expected. However ideal the representation of this future prosperity, it still remains within the circle of present circumstances. In the later view the present and the future became more and more pure contrasts, the gulf between the two ever deeper, the view ever more dualistic. With the appearance of Messianic times a new course of the world, a new עוֹלָם, is to begin. This future course of the world (עוֹלָם הַבָּא) is however in all respects the entire contrast to the present course of the world (עוֹלָם הַזֶּה). The present is under the rule of the ungodly powers of Satan and his angels, and therefore sunk in sin and sorrow. The future is under the rule of God and His Anointed: and only righteousness and happiness prevail therein. There can scarcely be any connection between the two. By a miraculous act of God the one will be destroyed, the other called into existence. However much this view may be supported by the former representation, the contrast between now and then is much more sharply drawn than in the former view. The latter sees far more the gracious government of God in the present time also. According to the later representation it might almost seem, as if God had for the present given over the government to the Satanic powers, and had reserved for the future world the full exercise of His sway. Accordingly the future salvation is also more and more regarded as purely transcendental. All the benefits of the future world come down from above, from heaven, where they had pre-existed from all eternity. They are kept there for the saints as an "inheritance," which will one day be bestowed upon them. In particular does the perfect, the glorious, new *Jerusalem*, which will at the time of the consummation of all things descend to earth in the place of the old, exist there already. So too *the Messiah*, the perfect

King of Israel, chosen by God from eternity, is already there in communion with God. All that is good and perfect can come only from above, because all that is earthly is in its present condition the direct contrary to the divine. At last therefore the hope of the future outsteps altogether the limits of earthly existence. The final happiness is not even found in the kingdom of glory upon the *renewed* earth, but in an absolute state of glory in heaven. As the salvation itself, so also is the manner of its realization more and more transcendentally conceived of. The judgment is a forensic act, in which, without the intervention of earthly powers, the fate of men is decided simply by the verdict of God, or of His Anointed; and the execution of this sentence is effected only by supernatural powers, by a miraculous act of God, which destroys the old and calls the new order of things into existence.

4. Lastly, the Messianic hope received an entirely new colouring in later times from the fact that it, like the whole circle of religious ideas in general, was *increasingly dogmatized* by the diligent labour of the scribes. In place of vigorous religious productiveness came the learned investigation of the prophetic writings, by which the details of the Messianic picture of the future were dogmatically settled. The task of the scribes was indeed at first the settling and treatment of *the law*. But they then, according to the same method, worked at and settled in detail the whole circle of religious ideas, and especially the Messianic expectations. Thus the poetic picture became learned dogma. While in the ideal imagery of the prophets the boundary of the literal and figurative meaning is evidently a fluctuating one, the sacred text of the prophets is taken at its word by the scribes of a later age, the poetic image is stiffened into dogma, and the character of the whole picture of the future becomes thereby increasingly an externally transcendental one. Not only moreover were all the existing details collected and dogmatically arranged, but new details were elicited by its

learned combination, after the manner of Haggadic Midrash (see above, § 25. III.). For the sake of obtaining new disclosures, the most heterogeneous passages were with the utmost ingenuity brought into relation with each other, and the details of Messianic theology thereby more accurately and comprehensively determined. It cannot be denied however, that such learned material also fluctuated, for it never became really binding like the details of the law. Thus the individual was at liberty to appropriate now more now less of it, and to fashion it according to his own perceptions, so that the Messianic hope was always fluctuating and is met with in very different forms among different individuals.

It must moreover be also remarked, that the peculiarities of the later Messianic expectation here described are by no means equally found everywhere. Even in later times, *the old hope of a glorious future for the nation maintained the supremacy.* This forms even in the later view of the future the determining ground-plan of the picture. And just as upon this foundation the characteristic peculiarities of the later view have stronger or weaker influence, and produce this or that alteration, is the old image now more now less, now in one way now in another, specially modified and supplemented.

But did this hope, we would next inquire, always continue active among the people? Did it not itself die out with the dying out of ancient prophecy, and revive to new life through the Christian movement? The latter has been frequently asserted, especially so far as the Messianic idea in its *narrower* sense of the expectation of a Messianic King is concerned. It is thought, that this was again stirred up by the appearance of Jesus Christ, and that it was thereby revivified even in the circles of Judaism. This assertion has been made in a summary manner by Bruno Bauer and Volkmar, in a more enlightened one and with better foundation by Holtzmann. The statements adduced by the latter are about these. After

the almost total extinction of the Messianic idea in the last centuries before Christ, it was reconstructed in the way of scholarship "by means of mere literary investigation." This process of new formation had in the time of Jesus been already entered upon, but did not receive its completion till the Christian period and under the partial influence of Christian ideas. The Messianic idea was in the time of Christ by no means an active one in the popular consciousness. An essential distinction between the later scholastic and the former prophetic idea of the Messiah was, that the prophets did not expect His appearance till after God Himself had in a decisive battle destroyed the hostile powers, while according to the later dogmatic the Messiah was to come to hold a judgment, and that a judgment in a forensic form. Setting aside for the present the latter point, we may sum up our verdict on Holtzmann's view by saying, that he is decidedly in the right, when he insists on the scholastic character of the later Messianic idea, but in the wrong, when he as good as denies the Messianic idea to the last centuries before Christ, and represents it as not yet transferred to popular consciousness during the life of Jesus. The latter is in opposition to the gospel history, and the former he can only maintain by either entirely disregarding evidence to the contrary (as Henoch, xc. 37–38; *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 46–50; Philo, *de praem. et poen.* § 16), or casting doubt upon the time of its composition (as the *Psalterium Salomonis*), or explaining it away in an arbitrary manner (as *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 652 sqq., which is said to relate to Simon the Maccabaean). In truth the Messianic idea never quite died out, at least not in its more general form of the hope of a better future for the nation. In any case it was again very active in the last centuries before Christ, and especially in the time of Christ, as the course of the gospel history shows. It there appears as thoroughly alive among the people, without Jesus doing anything to revive it; and indeed it appears as a rule in the

last centuries before Christ, not only in its general form as the hope of a better future of the nation, but also in its special form as the hope of a Messianic King. This will appear as we present in the following pages: (1) *The development of the Messianic idea in its historical course*; and (2) give a *Systematic view of Messianic dogmatics.*

## II. HISTORICAL SURVEY.

The prophecies of the Book of Daniel (about 167 to 165 before Christ) had a profound influence upon the form of the Messianic idea. In the time of the affliction (עֵת צָרָה, xii. 1), which had come upon Israel by reason of the insane measures of Antiochus Epiphanes, the prophet predicts the approaching deliverance. God will Himself sit in judgment on the kingdoms of this world, and will take from them power and dominion, and root up and destroy them for ever. But "the saints of the Most High" will receive the kingdom and possess it for ever and ever. All peoples and nations and tongues will serve them, and their kingdom will never be destroyed (vii. 9–27, ii. 44). The righteous too who have fallen asleep will have their share in it; for they will awake from the dust of the earth to everlasting life, but the ungodly to everlasting contempt (xii. 2). Whether the author conceived of this kingdom of the saints of the Most High, as with a Messianic King at its head, cannot be made out, at any rate he makes no mention of him. For he, who appears in the form of a man (כְּבַר אֱנָשׁ, vii. 13), is by no means the personal Messiah, but, as the author plainly and expressly says in the interpretation, the people of the saints of the Most High (vii. 18, 22, 27). As the kingdoms of the world are represented by beasts, which rise up out of the sea, so is the kingdom of the saints represented by a human form, which descends from the clouds of heaven.

The coming up out of the sea, *i.e.* the abyss, points to the anti-divine origin of the former, the coming from heaven to the divine origin of the latter. Thus the core of Daniel's Messianic hope is the *universal dominion of the saints* (see especially ii. 44, vii. 14, 27). And indeed the author does not, as might appear from chap. vii., conceive of this as brought about by a mere judicial sentence of God. On the contrary, he says expressly (ii. 44), that the kingdom of the saints shall "break in pieces and destroy," *i.e.* conquer by force of arms the world-kingdoms, by the help indeed of God and according to His will. It is also deserving of attention, that in this book the hope in a resurrection of the body is for the first time plainly and decidedly expressed (xii. 2). Hence here as formerly, the Messianic hope is the hope of a glorious future for the nation, but with the double modification that the future kingdom of Israel is conceived of as a universal kingdom, and that all the saints who have died will share in it.

In the apocryphal books of the Old Testament[3] the Messianic hope cannot, by reason of the historical or didactic nature of these books, be brought prominently forward. But it is by no means absent from them. Thus we find, in the Book of Ecclesiasticus, all the essential elements of the older Messianic hope, the expectation of penal judgment upon the heathen (Ecclus. xxxii. 18, 19, xxxiii. 1 sqq.), the deliverance of Israel from their troubles (Ecclus. l. 24), the gathering of the dispersed (xxxiii. 11), the everlasting duration of the nation (xxxvii. 25, xl. 13), nay, the everlasting duration of the Davidic dynasty (xlvii. 11). In the other apocryphal books too, we meet first one and then another element: that God will judge the heathen (Judith xvi. 17), and gather the dis-

[3] Comp. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, p. 160 sq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. ix. pp. 422–425 (2nd ed. ix. pp. 653–655). Anger, *Vorlesungen über die Geschichte der Messianischen Idee*, pp. 78 sq., 84 sq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 196 sqq.

persed of Israel into one nation again (2 Macc. ii. 18; Bar. ii. 27–35, iv. 36, 37, v. 5–9); that the people shall be established for ever (2 Macc. xiv. 15), and that the throne of David shall be an eternal one (1 Macc. ii. 57). The author of the Book of Tobit hopes, not only that the righteous will be gathered, the nation of Israel exalted, and Jerusalem rebuilt in the most splendid manner with gold and precious stones (Tob. xiii. 12–18, xiv. 7), but also, in common with certain prophets of the Old Testament, that all the heathen will be converted to God (Tob. xiii. 11, xiv. 6, 7). In the Hellenistic Wisdom of Solomon the national element is, as may be conceived, in the background, nay the author cannot, by reason of his Platonistic anthropology, expect true happiness for the soul till after death. With him therefore the important element is, that the *righteous dead* will one day sit in judgment upon the heathen (Wisd. iii. 8, v. 1; comp. 1 Cor. vi. 2 sq.). The explanation of the just man in Wisd. ii. 12–20 as the Messiah, which is prevalent in older exegesis, is utterly unfounded.[4]

The stream of Messianic prediction flows forth in copious abundance in the oldest Jewish *Sibyllines*, which appeared about 140 B.C. *Sibyll.* iii. 286 sq. must not indeed be referred to these (*Καὶ τότε δὴ θεὸς οὐρανόθεν πέμψει βασιλῆα, Κρινεῖ δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστον ἐν αἵματι καὶ πυρὸς αὐγῇ*), where on the contrary Cyrus is spoken of.[5] Nor can the *υἱὸς θεοῖο*, iii. 775, be appealed to. For according to the correct supposition of Alexandre, we must read *νηόν* instead of *υἱόν*. And lastly, it is quite a mistake to understand by the *κόρη*, in whom, according to *Sibyll.* iii. 748–786, God will dwell, the mother

[4] Comp. Reusch, Is Wisd. ii. 12–20 a Messianic prediction? (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1864, pp. 330–346).

[5] As even Hilgenfeld now admits (*Zeitschr. für w. Th.* 1871, p. 36), after having formerly disputed it (*Apokalyptik*, p. 64; *Zeitschr.* 1860, p. 315).

of Messiah (an explanation into which, following Langen,[6] even Weiffenbach[7] suffered himself to be seduced). For the κόρη, Hebr. בְּתוּלָה, is nothing else than Jerusalem. Still after the withdrawal of all these passages, it remains certain, that the whole section, *Sibyll.* iii. 652–794, is of almost exclusively Messianic purport, although only a short mention of the Messianic King is made at the beginning. From the east (ἀπ' ἠελίοιο), it is here said, will God send a king, who will put an end to all war upon earth, killing some, and fulfilling the promises to others. And he will do this not according to his own counsel, but in obedience to the commands of God.[8] At his appearance (for this is certainly the meaning of the author), the kings of the heathen assemble once more for an attack upon the temple of God and the Holy Land. They offer their idolatrous sacrifices round about Jerusalem. But God will speak to them with a mighty voice, and they will all perish by the hand of the Immortal. The earth will quake and the mountains and hills be overturned, and Erebus will appear. The heathen nations will perish by war, sword and fire, because they lifted their spears against the temple (663–697). Then will the children of God live in peace and quietness, because the hand of the Holy One protects them (698–709). And the heathen nations seeing this will be encouraged to bless and praise God, to send gifts to His temple and to accept His law, because it is the most just in all the world (710–726). Peace will then prevail among all the kings of the earth

[6] *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 401 sqq.
[7] *Quae Jesu in regno coelesti dignitas sit*, p. 50 sq.
[8] *Sibyll.* iii. 652–656 :—

Καὶ τότ' ἀπ' ἠελίοιο θεὸς πέμψει βασιλῆα,
Ὃς πᾶσαν γαῖαν παύσει πολέμοιο κακοῖο,
Οὓς μὲν ἄρα κτείνας, οἷς δ' ὅρκια πιστὰ τελέσσας.
Οὐδέ γε ταῖς ἰδίαις βουλαῖς τάδε πάντα ποιήσει,
Ἀλλὰ θεοῦ μεγάλοιο πιθήσας δόγμασιν ἐσθλοῖς.

(743–760). And God will set up an *eternal kingdom over all men.* Men will bring offerings to the temple of God from all parts of the earth. The prophets of God will lay down the sword, for they are judges of men and just kings. And God will dwell upon Zion and universal peace will prevail upon earth (766–794). The writer lays the chief stress, as we see, upon the circumstance, that the law of God will attain recognition and validity among all the nations of the earth, but he expects not this alone, but the setting up of a universal kingdom over all mankind (766–767: *βασιλήϊον εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους*) with Jerusalem as its theocratic centre. It is only at the beginning that he thinks of the king sent from God as the instrument for the establishment of the universal peace. But he is undoubtedly to be thought of as the intervening cause, when it is said, ver. 689, that God exterminates the attacking heathen by war and sword (*πολέμῳ ἠδὲ μαχαίρῃ*). And if the prophets of God (*θεοῦ μεγάλοιο προφῆται, i.e.* indeed the Israelites, the saints of the Most High as they are called in Daniel) are only generally spoken of as judges and kings (780–781), still a theocratic king at their head is at least not excluded by the words of the author. It is in any case worthy of remark, that even an Alexandrian, when painting the future, cannot dispense with the God-sent king.

The original portion of the Book of Enoch (in the last third of the 2nd century before Christ) contains comparatively little that is Messianic. It is the conclusion of the vision of Judgment (c. 90. 16–38), which is here chiefly to be considered. The author expects in the first place a last powerful attack of the heathen (here chiefly the Syrian) power, which is however rendered vain by the miraculous intervention of God (90. 16–19). A throne is then erected in the delightful land and God sits in judgment. First the fallen angels and then the apostate Jews are cast into the fiery pit (90. 20–27).

Then the old Jerusalem (for the "house" is Jerusalem) is done away with, and God brings a new Jerusalem and places it on the spot where the old one stood (90. 28–29). In this new Jerusalem dwell the pious Jews, and the heathen do them homage (90. 30). Hereupon the Messiah appears (under the image of a white bullock), and all the heathen pray to Him and are converted to God (90. 37–38). The transcendent character of the later Messianic idea here comes forward: the new Jerusalem has nothing in common with the old, but is brought from heaven in a miraculous manner.

We meet with the Messianic King depicted in sharper outlines and fuller colours in the *Psalterium Salomonis*, composed in the time of Pompey (63–48 B.C.). These Psalms are instructive, if only because their author dwells both upon God Himself being the King of Israel (xvii. 1), and David's house never becoming extinct before God (xvii. 5). Hence it must not be concluded, without further ceremony, that when the former takes place, the latter is excluded. The longing for the Davidic king is especially ardent in the author, for Jerusalem had, in his time, fallen under the heathen rule of the Romans, and no hope for the future could be built upon the Sadducean-minded dynasty of the Asmonaeans. Hence he hopes, that God will raise up a prince of the house of David to rule over Israel, to crush their enemies, and to cleanse Jerusalem from the heathen (xvii. 23–27). He will gather a holy people, and will judge the tribes of the nation, and not suffer unrighteousness in their midst, he will divide them in the land according to their tribes, and no stranger shall dwell among them (xvii. 28–31). The heathen nations will serve him and will come to Jerusalem, to bring the wearied children of Israel as gifts and to see the glory of the Lord. He is a righteous king and one taught of God (xvii. 32–35). And there is no unrighteousness in his days, for all are saints. And their

king is the Lord's anointed.[9] He will not place his trust in horse or rider. For the Lord Himself is his King. And he will strike the earth with the word of his mouth for ever (xvii. 36–39). He will bless the people of the Lord with wisdom; and he is pure from sin; and he will rule over a great people and not be weak. For God makes him strong by His Holy Spirit. He will lead them all in holiness, and there is no pride among them (xvii. 40–46). This is the beauty of the king of Israel. Happy are they, who are born in his days (xvii. 47–51). The writer expects, as it appears, not godly kings in general of David's house, but a single Messiah endowed by God with miraculous powers, pure from sin and holy (xvii. 41, 46), whom God has made powerful and wise by the Holy Spirit (xvii. 2), and who therefore strikes his enemies not with external weapons, but with the word of his mouth (xvii. 39 after Isa. xi. 4). He is however, notwithstanding such idealism, represented as quite a worldly ruler, as an actual king of Israel. Comp. generally, Ps. xviii. 6–10, and especially Ps. xi. (the gathering of the dispersed) and iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq. (the resurrection of the just).

As the oppression of the Pompeian period was the occasion of the Psalter of Solomon, so also was the despotism of Antony and Cleopatra that of a more recent Sibylline piece (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 36–92). When Rome had then obtained dominion over Egypt also, the Sibyllist expected the appearance of the kingdom of God on earth and the coming of a holy king to rule for ever over every land. The passage in question (iii. 46–50) is as follows:—

*Αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ Ῥώμη καὶ Αἰγύπτου βασιλεύσει,*
*Εἷς ἓν ἰθύνουσα, τότε δὴ βασιλεία μεγίστη*

[9] Χριστὸς κύριος, xvii. 36, like Lam. iv. 20, is a wrong translation for מְשִׁיחַ יְהוָה. The correct Χριστὸς κυρίου is found xviii. 8. Comp. also xviii. 6.

*Ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος ἐπ' ἀνθρώποισι φανεῖται.*
*Ἥξει δ' ἀγνὸς ἄναξ, πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων*
*Εἰς αἰῶνας πάντας, ἐπειγομένοιο χρόνοιο.*

The immortal King, whose kingdom is to appear among men, is of course God Himself. On the other hand, none other than the Messiah can be meant by the *ἁγνὸς ἄναξ*, who is to possess the sceptre of every kingdom. Here too, as in the Psalter of Solomon, we find the personal Messiah and the idea of the kingdom of God in direct combination.

If in the Psalter of Solomon the form of the Messianic King is already one far surpassing the ordinary human form, this feature comes out more strikingly in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (chap. xxxvii.–lxxi.). The image of the Messiah is here chiefly drawn, in continuation of the Book of Daniel, by "the Son of man" being understood of the person of Messiah, and the coming from heaven taken literally; pre-existence being therefore ascribed to the Messiah. But unfortunately the date of the composition of this book is so uncertain, that we must renounce its insertion in the historical development. Use can only be made of it for the systematic survey.

The *Assumptio Mosis*, of about the beginning of the Christian era, predicts in words of beautiful aspiration the approach of the kingdom of God. The author, after bringing into view a time of tribulation such as that under Antiochus Epiphanes, continues, chap. x.: "Then will his kingdom appear among all creatures, and the devil will have an end, and sorrow will disappear with him. Then will the Heavenly One arise from the seat of his kingdom and will come from his holy habitation with wrath and anger for his children's sake, and the earth will tremble to its ends, and the high mountains be lowered, and the hills fall. The sun will give no light, and the moon be changed into blood (comp. Joel iii. 4), and the

stars fall into confusion. And the sea will retreat to the abyss, and the water-springs fail, and the rivers be dried up. Then will the most High God, the alone Eternal, come forth to chastise the heathen and destroy all idols. Then wilt thou be happy, O Israel, and wilt tread upon the neck and wings of the eagle. And God will exalt thee and make thee soar to the firmament, and thou wilt thence look down upon thine enemies on earth, and shalt see them and rejoice, and give thanks and acknowledge thy Creator." That in this magnificent picture of the future there should be no mention of the Messianic King, is certainly not accidental, if it is the case that the author belonged to the party of the Zealots (see below, § 32). This circumstance would then, as Wieseler justly remarks,[10] be explained by the fact, that the author's ideal would be, not a monarchic, but, if we may use the expression, a democratically constituted kingdom of God.

Equally without mention of a Messianic King, and on the whole in merely general outlines, does the *Book of Jubilees* describe the time of joy and delight, which will appear for Israel on their repentance.[11] "The days will begin to increase, and the children of men will be older from generation to generation and from day to day, till the length of their life approaches a thousand years. And there will be none old or weary of life, but they will all be like children and youths, and will pass and live all their days in peace and joy, without there being any Satan or other evil spoiler; for all their days will be days of blessing and healing. At that time will the Lord heal His servants, and they will arise and see ever deeper peace and pursue again their enemies. And they will see it and give thanks, and rejoice for evermore. And they will see all the judgments and all the curse of their enemies. Their bones will indeed rest in the earth, but their spirits will have many joys, and they

[10] *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1868, p. 645.

[11] Ewald's *Jahrbücher der Biblischen Wissenschaft*, 3rd year, p. 24.

will perceive, that it is the Lord who sits in judgment and shows grace to hundreds and thousands and to all who love Him." While it is here said only in general, that the servants of the Lord "will again pursue their enemies," in another passage the *dominion of the world* is promised to the seed of Jacob.[12] God said to Jacob: "I am the Lord thy God, who made heaven and earth. I will cause thee to grow and will greatly increase thee; and kings shall proceed from thee and shall rule everywhere, even wherever the foot of the children of men shall tread. And I will give to thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule according to their choice over all nations; and afterwards they shall draw the whole earth to themselves and inherit it to eternity."

It is very characteristic testimony to the intensity of the Messianic hope in the age of Jesus Christ, that even a moralist like Philo should depict the happiness to be expected by the righteous, in the frame and with the colouring of Jewish national expectations.[13] Two passages of his work "on the reward of the good and the punishment of the wicked" come in this respect especially under consideration (*De exsecrationibus*, § 8–9, ed. Mang. ii. 435 sq., and *De praemiis et poenis*, § 15–20, ed. Mang. ii. 421–428). In the former passage he expresses the hope, that all Israelites, or rather all who are converted to the law of God (for it depends on this and not on natural descent from Abraham), will be gathered in the Holy Land. "Though they should be in the ends of the earth as slaves among their enemies, who have taken them captive, yet will they all be set at liberty at a given sign on one day, because their sudden turning to virtue astonishes their masters.

[12] Ewald's *Jahrbücher*, iii. 42.

[13] Comp. on the Messianic idea in Philo, Gfrörer, *Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie*, i. 495–534. Dähne, *Geschichtl. Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religionsphilosophie*, i. 432–438. J. G. Müller, *Die messianischen Erwartungen des Juden Philo*. Basel 1870 (25, p. 4).

For they will release them because they are ashamed of bearing rule over their betters. When then this unexpected freedom is bestowed on those, who were before scattered in Hellas and in barbarous countries, on islands and on the continent, they will hasten with one impulse from all quarters to the place pointed out to them, led by a Divine superhuman appearance, which, invisible to all others, is visible only to the delivered.[14] . . . When then they have arrived, the ruined cities will be rebuilt, and the desert reinhabited, and the barren land become fertile." In the other passage (*De praemiis et poenis*, § 15 sqq., Mang. ii. 421 sqq.), Philo describes the time of prosperity and peace, which will appear when men turn to God. Before all they will be safe from wild beasts. "Bears, lions, panthers, Indian elephants, tigers and all kinds of beasts of uncontrollable strength and power will turn from their solitary ways of life to one according to law, and from intercourse with few, after the manner of gregarious animals, will accustom themselves to the sight of man, who will not as formerly be attacked by them, but feared as their master, and they will respect him as their natural lord. Some even, emulating the tame animals, will offer him their homage by wagging their tails like lap-dogs. The race too of scorpions, snakes and other reptiles will then no longer have any harmful poison" (§ 15). A further blessing of this time is peace among men. "*Then says the prophecy* (LXX. Num. xxiv. 7) *a man who goes to battle and makes war shall go forth and subdue great and populous nations*, God Himself sending help to His saints. This consists in unshaken boldness of mind and invincible strength of body, qualities each of which singly is terrible to enemies, but which when combined nothing

[14] ξεναγούμενοι πρός τινος θειοτέρας ἢ κατὰ φύσιν ἀνθρωπίνης ὄψεως, ἀδήλου μὲν ἑτέροις, μόνοις δὲ τοῖς ἀνασωζομένοις ἐμφανοῦς. That this divine appearance is *not* the Messiah, but one analogous to the pillar of fire in the march through the desert, scarcely needs mention.

is able to resist. But some of the enemies are, as the prophecy says, not even worthy to perish by the hand of man. Against them He (God) will send swarms of wasps, who fight to a shameful overthrow for the saints. But these (instead of τοῦτον we must read τούτους, *i.e.* the saints) will not only have certain victory in battle without bloodshed, but also invincible power of government for the welfare of their subjects, who will submit from either love, fear, or reverence. For they (the saints) possess three qualities, which are the greatest, and which found an indestructible dominion. Holiness, great power and benevolence (σεμνότητα καὶ δεινότητα καὶ εὐεργεσίαν), the first of which produces reverence, the second fear, the third love, but if they are harmoniously combined in the soul, they produce subjects, who are obedient to their rulers" (§ 16). Philo next mentions riches and prosperity (§ 20), health and strength of body, as blessings of Messianic times (§ 17–18). It is evident, that notwithstanding his efforts always to lay the chief emphasis on the ethic, he was not able to avoid popular notions. For he too expected, after the realization of the ethic ideal, a time of external prosperity and happiness for the pious and virtuous, one feature of which would be, that they should have dominion upon earth. Nor was the Messianic King absent from this image. For who else than he could be intended by the man, who goes to battle, carries on war and subdues great and populous nations? And the less such a God-sent hero is required by Philo's fundamental view, the more worthy of remark is it, that he is nevertheless included in his description of the Messianic age.

But even apart from such evidence, it is already plain from the *New Testament*, that the Messianic idea was anything but extinct in the popular consciousness in the period before Christ. We easily see from the question of John: "Art Thou He that should come, or do we look for another?" (Matt. xi. 3;

Luke vii. 19–29), that the coming One was expected. And the whole course of the gospel history—to mention only Peter's confession (Matt. xvi. 13 sqq.; Mark viii. 27 sqq.; Luke ix. 18 sqq.)—clearly shows that Jesus in acknowledging Himself to be the Messiah, was only connecting Himself with existing ideas. He by no means aimed in the first place at the revival and animation of Messianic hopes. And yet we find, that at His entry into Jerusalem, the whole multitude hailed Him as the Messiah (Matt. xxi.; Mark xi.; Luke xix.; John xii.). Such scenes are only to be explained on the assumption, that the Messianic hope was, before His appearance, already active in the nation.

This also needs no proof for the period after Christ. *The numerous popular tumults of a politico-religious kind, which took place in the time of the Roman procurators* (A.D. 44–66), give sufficient evidence of the feverish tension, with which a miraculous intervention of God in history and the appearance of His kingdom on earth were expected. How else could men such as Theudas the Egyptian have found believers for their promises by hundreds and thousands? Even Josephus superabundantly confesses, that the Messianic hope was one of the most powerful levers in the great insurrection against Rome. He himself did not indeed shrink from applying the Messianic prophecies to Vespasian, and in this respect he found approving faith from Tacitus and Suetonius.[15]

[15] On the Messianic notions of Josephus, see Gerlach, *Die Weissagungen des Alten Testaments in den Schriften des Flavius Josephus* (1863), pp. 41–89. Langen in the *Tüb. Theol. Quartalschrift*, 1865, pp. 39–51. The passage in question in *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 4 is as follows: Τὸ δὲ ἐπᾶραν αὐτοὺς μάλιστα πρὸς τὸν πόλεμον ἦν χρησμὸς ἀμφίβολος ὁμοίως ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς εὑρημένος γράμμασιν, ὡς κατὰ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας τις αὐτῶν ἄρξει τῆς οἰκουμένης. Τοῦτο οἱ μὲν ὡς οἰκεῖον ἐξέλαβον, καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν σοφῶν ἐπλανήθησαν περὶ τὴν κρίσιν· ἐδήλου δ' ἄρα τὴν Οὐεσπασιανοῦ τὸ λόγιον ἡγεμονίαν, ἀποδειχθέντος ἐπὶ Ἰουδαίας αὐτοκράτορος. Comp. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 13: Pluribus persuasio inerat, antiquis sacerdotum literis contineri, eo ipso tempore fore ut valesceret oriens profectique Judaea rerum potirentur. Quae ambages

On the state of the Messianic hope after the destruction of the temple, and during the last decades of the first century after Christ, we have copious information in the Apocalypses of Baruch and Ezra. The *Apolcaypse of Baruch* describes the course of the last things as follows: A time of general and terrible confusion will first of all occur. Men will mutually hate and fight against each other. The disreputable will rule over the respectable, the base will be exalted above the illustrious, the ungodly above heroes. And the nations (whom God has previously prepared for the purpose—we cannot but think of Gog and Magog) will come and fight against the princes who remain. And it will come to pass, that he who escapes from war, will perish by the earthquake, and he who escapes this, by fire, and he who escapes the fire, by famine. And he who escapes all these ills will be delivered into the hands of the Messiah (lxx. 2–10). For he will be manifested, and destroy the hosts of the last universal kingdom. And the last prince, who is left, will be chained and brought to Zion, and the Messiah will convict him of ungodliness and put him to death (xxxix. 7–40, 2). The Messiah will gather the nations, and to some he will grant life, and others he will destroy with the sword. He will grant life to those who have submitted to the seed of Jacob. But those who have oppressed Israel will be destroyed (lxxii. 2–6). Then will he sit upon the throne of his kingdom for ever;[16] and peace will appear,

Vespasianum ac Titum praedixerant; sed volgus more humanae cupidinis sibi tantam fatorum magnitudinem interpretati ne adversis quidem ad vera mutabantur. Sueton. *Vesp.* c. 4: Percrebuerat oriente toto vetus et constans opinio, esse in fatis, ut eo tempore Judaea profecti rerum potirentur. Id de imperatore Romano, quantum postea eventu paruit, praedictum Judaei ad se trahentes rebellarunt. It is hardly to be doubted, that Tacitus and Suetonius drew, whether directly or indirectly, entirely from Josephus. Comp. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* i. 1, p. 51. This is disputed by Keim in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xvii. 164 (art. "Vespasianus").

[16] Cap. lxxiii. 1: Et sedebit in pace in aeternum super throno regni sui. xl. 3: Et erit principatus ejus stans in sacculum, donec finiatur mundus

and sorrow and tribulation depart from mankind, and joy prevail over the whole earth. And the wild beasts shall come and serve men, and vipers and serpents shall be subject to children. And the reapers shall not be faint, nor the builders weary (lxxiii.–lxxiv.; comp. xl. 2, 3). And the earth shall yield her fruits a thousandfold, and on one vine there shall be a thousand branches, and on one branch a thousand clusters, and on one cluster a thousand grapes, and one grape will yield a cor of wine.[17] And manna will again fall from heaven, and it shall be again eaten in those days (xxix. 5–8). And after the end of that time all the dead will arise, the just and the unjust, in the same bodily form which they formerly had. Then will judgment be held. And after the judgment the risen will be changed. The bodies of the just will be transfigured in brightness, but those of the unjust will dwindle and become uglier than before. And they will be given up to torment. But the just will behold the invisible world, and will dwell in the high places of that world. And Paradise spreads out before them, and they see the hosts of angels who stand before the throne of God. And their glory is greater than that of the angels (chap. xxx., l., and li.; comp. xliv. 15).

The eschatological expectations of the fourth Book of Esdras agree in all essential points with those of Baruch. He too predicts first a time of fearful want and distress (v. 1–13, vi. 18–28, ix. 1–12, xiii. 29–31). After this the Messiah, the Son of God, will be revealed, and it will come to pass, that when the nations hear His voice they will forget war amongst each other, and will assemble in an innumerable multitude for an attack against the anointed. But he will stand upon Mount Zion, and will convict them of their ungodliness,

corruptionis. From the last passage it appears that the reign of Messiah is not to last "for ever" in the strict sense, but only to the end of the present world.

[17] Comp. Papias in *Irenaeus*, v. 33. 3.

and destroy them by the law without battle and without weapons (xiii. 25–28, 32–38; comp. xii. 31–33). Then will the hidden city (viz. New Jerusalem) appear (vii. 26); and the ten tribes will return to the Holy Land (xiii. 39–47). And the anointed will protect and rejoice the people of God in the Holy Land, and show them many miracles for *four hundred years* (vii. 27, 28, xii. 34, xiii. 48–50; comp. ix. 8). And after this the anointed and all men who have breath will die. And the world will again return to the silence of death for seven days, as at the beginning. And after seven days a world which now sleeps will awake, and the corrupt world will perish. And the earth will restore those who sleep in it; and the receptacles will give back the souls committed to them (vii. 29–32). And the Most High will appear upon the judgment-seat, and long-suffering will have an end; only judgment will remain, and the reward come to light (vii. 33–35). And the place of torment will be revealed, and opposite to it the place of rest; the pit of hell, and opposite to it Paradise. And the Most High will say to the risen: Behold Him whom you denied and did not honour, and whose commands you did not obey. Here is joy and delight, there is fire and torment. And the length of the day of judgment will be a week of years (vi. 1–17, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation; comp. also vv. 59 and 68–72, ed. Fritzsche, in Bensley, *The Missing Fragment*, etc. 1875, pp. 55–58, 64, 69 sq.).

Thus the two Apocalypses. That their hopes are not those of individuals, but form an essential element of Jewish consciousness is still shown by the Shemoneh Esreh, the daily prayer of the Israelites, which received its present form about A.D. 100. As it has been fully given above (p. 85 sq.), we need here only recall that in the 10th petition the gathering of the dispersed, in the 11th the reinstitution of the native authorities, in the 14th the rebuilding of Jerusalem, in the

15th the sending of the son of David and the setting up of his kingdom, and lastly, in the 17th, the restoration of the sacrificial worship at Jerusalem, are prayed for. Such was the hope and prayer of every Israelite after the destruction of the Jewish polity.[18]

We have in this survey purposely passed over the Targums, in which "King Messiah" frequently appears.[19] For the opinion, that the older Targums originated in the time of Jesus Christ, may now be regarded as given up. They probably belong to the third or fourth century after Christ, at any rate, there is no proof of their greater antiquity, though they often fall back upon older exegetical traditions. Their case is the same as that of the other rabbinical works (the Mishna, Talmud, and Midrash), viz. that they are based upon older materials, but do not in their existing form belong to the period of which we are treating. The essential outlines of the Messianic hope of Judaism in this later time (about the beginning of the third century) are very well summed up by the author of the *Philosophumena*, who describes them in the following manner:[20] they say that the Messiah will proceed

[18] The prayer for the rebuilding of Jerusalem and the restoration of the Aboda (the sacrificial service) occurs also in the Paschal Liturgy, *Pesachim* x. 6.

[19] See in Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 1268–1273, a list of passages in the Targums applying to the Messiah. Comp. also Im. Schwarz, *Jesus Targumicus*, 2 parts, 4. Torgau 1758–59. Ayerst, תקות ישראל, *the hope of Israel, or the doctrine of the ancient Jews concerning the Messiah, as stated in the Targums*, p. 52. Langen, *Das Judenth. in Palästina*, pp. 418–429.

[20] *Philosophum.* ix. 30: Γένεσιν μὲν γὰρ αὐτοῦ [*scil.* τοῦ Χριστοῦ] ἐσομένην λέγουσιν ἐκ γένους Δαβίδ, ἀλλ' οὐκ ἐκ παρθένου καὶ ἁγίου πνεύματος, ἀλλ' ἐκ γυναικὸς καὶ ἀνδρός, ὡς πᾶσιν ὅρος γεννᾶσθαι ἐκ σπέρματος, Φάσκοντες τοῦτον ἐσόμενον βασιλέα ἐπ' αὐτούς, ἄνδρα πολεμιστὴν καὶ δυνατόν, ὃς ἐπισυνάξας τὸ πᾶν ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων, πάντα τὰ ἔθνη πολεμήσας, ἀναστήσει αὐτοῖς τὴν Ἱερουσαλὴμ πόλιν βασιλίδα, εἰς ἣν ἐπισυνάξει ἅπαν τὸ ἔθνος καὶ πάλιν ἐπὶ τὰ ἀρχαῖα ἔθη ἀποκαταστήσει βασιλεῦον καὶ ἱερατεῦον καὶ κατοικοῦν ἐν πεπονθήσει ἐν χρόνοις ἱκανοῖς· ἔπειτα ἐπαναστῆναι κατ' αὐτῶν πόλεμον ἐπισυναχθέντων· ἐν ἐκείνῳ τῷ πολέμῳ πεσεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν ἐν μαχαίρῃ, ἔπειτα μετ' οὐ πολὺ τὴν συντέλειαν καὶ ἐκπύρωσιν τοῦ παντὸς ἐπιστῆναι, καὶ οὕτως τὰ περὶ τὴν ἀνάστασιν

from the house of David, not from a virgin and the Holy Ghost, but from a man and woman, as it is appointed to all to be born from seed. He will, they believe, be king over them, a warlike and powerful man, who will gather together the whole nation of the Jews, and carry on war with all nations, and build Jerusalem as a royal city for the Jews, in which he will assemble the whole nation, putting it into its old condition as a ruling and a sacrifice-offering nation, which will long dwell in safety. Afterwards war will arise against them collectively, and in this war the Messiah will fall by the sword. Not long after will follow the end and the conflagration of the world, and then will be fulfilled that which is believed with respect to the resurrection, and retribution be done to every one according to his works.

### III. SYSTEMATIC STATEMENT.

We supplement this historical survey by giving also in the following pages a *systematic statement* of Messianic doctrinal theology on the foundation of the Shema, as resulting from the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras. For the eschatological expectation is most fully developed in these two Apocalypses.

1. *The last tribulation and perplexity.*[21] Almost everywhere when the last things are referred to, the thought recurs with different variations, that the appearance of redemption must be preceded by a period of special trouble and affliction.

δοξαζόμενα ἐπιτελεσθῆναι, τάς τε ἀμοιβὰς ἑκάστῳ κατὰ τὰ πεπραγμένα ἀποδοθῆναι.

[21] Comp. Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, ii. 509 sqq., 550 sqq. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 45–54. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 225 f., 300–304. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 436 f. (2nd ed. ix. 666). Renan, *L'Antichrist*. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Messianische Leidenszeit" (pp. 735–738).

It was indeed in itself an obvious thought, that the path to happiness should pass through tribulation. This was also expressly predicted in the Old Testament (Hos. xiii. 13; Dan. xii. 1, and elsewhere); and thus was formed in Rabbinical theology, the doctrine of the חֲבָלֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ, the travail of the Messiah, which must precede His birth, *i.e.* His appearing (the expression according to Hos. xiii. 13; comp. Matt. xxiv. 8: *πάντα δὲ ταῦτα ἀρχὴ ὠδίνων*; Mark xiii. 9: *ἀρχαὶ ὠδίνων ταῦτα*). The threatening troubles will be announced by omens of all kinds. The sun and moon will be darkened, swords appear in heaven, trains of horse and foot march through the clouds (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 795–807; comp. 2 Macc. v. 2, 3. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 5. 3. Tacit. *Hist.* v. 13). Everything in nature falls into commotion and confusion. The sun appears by night, the moon by day. Blood trickles from wood, the stone gives forth a voice, and salt is found in fresh water (4 Ezra v. 1–13). Places that have been sown will appear as unsown, full barns be found empty, and the springs of the wells be stopped (4 Ezra vi. 18–28). Among men all the restraints of order will be dissolved, sin and ungodliness rule upon earth. And men will fight against each other as if stricken with madness, the friend against the friend, the son against the father, the daughter against the mother. Nation will rise against nation, and to war shall be added earthquakes, fire, and famine, whereby men shall be carried off (*Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* vol. iii. p. 23 sq. Apocal. Baruch lxx. 2–8; 4 Ezra vi. 24, ix. 1–12, xiii. 29–31; Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15).[22]

[22] Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15, according to Jost's translation, is as follows: "As traces of the approach of Messiah are to be regarded, that arrogance increases, ambition shoots up, that the vine yields fruit and yet wine is dear. The government turns to heresy. There is no instruction. The place of assembly (the synagogue) is devoted to lewdness. Galilee is destroyed, Gablan laid waste. The inhabitants of a district go from city to city, without finding compassion. The wisdom of the learned is hated, the godly despised, truth is absent. Boys insult old men, old men stand in the presence of children. The son depreciates the father, the daughter rebels

Comp. also Matt. xxiv. 7–12, 21; Mark xiii. 9; Luke xxi. 23; 1 Cor. vii. 26; 2 Tim. iii. 1.

2. *Elijah as the forerunner.*[23] The return of the prophet Elijah to prepare the way of the Messiah was expected on the ground of Mal. iii. 23, 24. This view is already taken for granted in the Book of Ecclesiasticus (xlviii. 10, 11). It is, as is well known, frequently alluded to in the New Testament (see especially Matt. xvii. 10; Mark ix. 11; also Matt. xi. 14, xvi. 14; Mark vi. 15, viii. 28; Luke ix. 8, 19; John i. 21). It was even transferred to the Christian circle of ideas.[24] According to Mal. iii. 24, the object of his mission is chiefly considered to be, to make peace upon earth and in general to substitute order for disorder (Matt. xvii. 11: *ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα*; Mark ix. 12: *ἀποκαθιστάνει πάντα*). The chief passage in the Mishna is as follows:[25] "R. Joshua said: I received the tradition from R. Johanan ben Sakkai, who received it from his teacher as a tradition in a direct line from Moses at Mount Sinai, that Elias would not come to

against the mother, the daughter-in-law against the mother-in-law. A man's enemies are his house-fellows" (comp. Micah vii. 6; Matt. x. 35, 36; Luke xii. 53). *The whole passage however does not belong to the genuine text of the Mishna.* It is wanting, *e.g.* in the *Editio princeps*, Naples 1492. Being in the Jerusalem Talmud, it was certainly introduced thence into the Mishna.

[23] Comp. Schoettgen, *Horae Hebraicae*, ii. 533 sqq. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Matt. xvii. 10. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 58–68. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 227–229. Alexandre, *Oracula Sibyllina* (1st ed.), ii. 513–516. S. K., *Der Prophet Elia in der Legende* (*Monatsschr. f. Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1863, pp. 241–255, 281–296). "Elias who was to come" (*Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*, new series, vol. x. 1867, pp. 371–376). Renan, *L'Antichrist.* Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, pp. 196–201. Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, pp. 337–339.

[24] *Commodian. Carmen apologet.* v. 826 sq. *Orac. Sibyll.* ii. 187–190 (of Christian origin):—

> Καὶ τόθ' ὁ Θεσβίτης γε, ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ ἅρμα τιταίνων
> Οὐράνιον, γαίῃ δ' ἐπιβάς, τότε σήματα τρισσὰ
> Κόσμῳ ὅλῳ δείξει τε ἀπολλυμένου βιότοιο.

[25] *Edujoth* viii. 7.

pronounce clean or unclean, to reject or admit families in general, but only to reject those who had entered by violence, and to admit those who had been rejected by violence. There was, beyond Jordan, a family of the name of Beth Zerefa, which a certain Ben Zion had excluded by violence. There was there another family (of impure blood), whom this Ben Zion had admitted by violence. Therefore he comes to pronounce such clean or unclean, to reject or to admit them. R. Jehudah says: only to admit, but not to reject. R. Simon says: his mission is merely to *arrange disputes*. The learned say neither to reject nor admit, but his coming is merely with the object of making peace in the world. For it is said: 'I send you, Elijah the prophet, to turn the heart of the fathers to the children, and the heart of the children to the fathers' (Mal. iii. 4)." To the duty of the institutors of peace and order belongs also the decision of disputed cases. Therefore it is said in the Mishna, that money and property whose owners are disputed, or anything found whose owner is unknown, must wait "till Elijah comes."[26] The view that he will anoint the Messiah,[27] and raise the dead,[28] is also found in single instances. Besides Elijah, *the prophet like Moses*, who is promised Deut. xviii. 15 (John i. 21, vi. 14, vii. 40), was expected by many, while by others this passage was applied to the Messiah Himself. Allusions are also found in the New Testament to other prophets as forerunners of the Messiah, as *e.g.* Jeremiah (Matt. xvi. 14). In Christian authorities a

[26] *Baba mezia* iii. 4, 5, i. 8, ii. 8. Comp. also *Shekalim* ii. 5, *fin.*

[27] Justin. *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 8: Χριστὸς δὲ εἰ καὶ γεγένηται καὶ ἔστι που, ἄγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δύναμίν τινα, μέχρις ἂν ἐλθὼν Ἠλίας χρίσῃ αὐτὸν καὶ φανερὸν πᾶσι ποιήσῃ. Ibid. c. 49: Καὶ γὰρ πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι καὶ τὸν Ἠλίαν χρίσαι αὐτὸν ἐλθόντα. Comp. also John i. 31.

[28] *Sota* ix. 15 (quite at the end): "The resurrection of the dead comes through the prophet Elijah. The expectation is founded on the fact, that Elijah figures in the Old Testament as a raiser of the dead."

return of Enoch is also spken of (Ev. Nicodemi, c. 25, and the patristic exegetes on Rev. xi. 3).[29]

3. *The appearing of the Messiah.* After these preparations the Messiah will appear. For it is by no means the case, that pre-Christian Judaism did not expect the Messiah till *after* the judgment, and that it was under the influence of Christianity, that the notion of the Messiah Himself sitting in judgment upon His enemies was first found. For not only in Baruch and Ezra, not only in the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch and in the Targums (where perhaps Christian influence might be admitted), but also in the oldest *Sibyll* (iii. 652–656), in the Psalter of Solomon (xvii. 24, 26, 27, 31, 38, 39, 41), and in Philo (*De praemiis et poenis*, § 16), and thus in decidedly pre-Christian documents, does Messiah appear for the overthrow of the ungodly powers. And the opposite view, that He will not appear till *after* the judgment, is found only in a solitary instance, viz. in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch (xc. 16–38). Hence His appearing must undoubtedly be spoken of in this place.

First with regard to his name as the appointed King of Israel and the anointed of God, he is most frequently called *the Anointed, the Messiah* (Enoch xlviii. 10, lii. 4; Apocal. Baruch xxix. 3, xxx. 1, xxxix. 7, xl. 1, lxx. 9, lxxii. 2; Ezra vii. 28, 29, where the Latin translation is interpolated; Ezra xii. 32: Unctus); Greek, *Χριστὸς κυρίου* (Psalt. Solom. xvii. 36, xviii. 6, 8); Hebr. הַמָּשִׁיחַ (Mishna, *Berachoth* i. 5); Aramaic, מְשִׁיחָא (Mishna, *Sota* ix. 15); or מַלְכָּא מְשִׁיחָא (both frequently in the Targums). The designation—the Son of man—which arose from appropriating directly to the Messiah, the image in Daniel of one coming in the clouds of heaven in the form of a man, but which, according to the context in Daniel, signifies the church and kingdom of God, is peculiar

[29] Comp. Philo, *Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test.* pp. 756–768, and the commentaries on John xi. 3

to the figurative addresses of the Book of Enoch (xlvi. 1–4, xlviii. 2, lxii. 7, 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26, 27, lxx. 1). Inasmuch as the Messiah is the chosen instrument of God, and the love of God rests upon Him, He is called *the Elect* (Enoch xlv. 3, 4, xlix. 2, li. 3, 5, lii. 6, 9, liii. 6, lv. 4, lxi. 8, lxii. 1), or like the theocratic king in the Old Testament, the *Son of God* (Enoch cv. 2; 4 Ezra vii. 28, 29, xiii. 32, 37, 52, xiv. 9). In Enoch the title *Son of the Woman* once occurs, perhaps as a Christian interpolation, Enoch lxii. 5. It was universally acknowledged, on the ground of Old Testament prophecy,[30] that He would proceed from the *race of David* (Psalt. Solom. xvii. 5, 23; Matt. xxii. 42; Mark xii. 35; Luke xx. 41; John vii. 42; 4 Ezra xii. 32;[31] Targum Jonathan on Isa. xi. 1; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxxiii. 15). Hence, Son of David is a usual title of the Messiah (frequently in the New Testament *υἱὸς Δαυίδ*; in Targum Jonathan on Hosea iii. 5, בַּר דָּוִד; in the Shemoneh Esreh, 15th Berachah, צֶמַח דָּוִד). As Davidic He was also to be born in Bethlehem, the town of David (Micah v. 1 with the Targum; Matt. ii. 5; John vii. 41, 42).

Whether pre-Christian Judaism regarded the Messiah as simply human, or as a being of a higher order, and especially whether it attributed to him pre-existence, cannot, with the uncertainty about the dates of authorities, be positively decided.[32] *The original Messianic hope did not expect an individual Messiah at all, but theocratic kings of the house of*

[30] Isa. xi. 1, 10; Jer. xxiii. 5, xxx. 9, xxxiii. 15, 17, 22; Ezek. xxxiv. 23 f., xxxvii. 24 f.; Hosea iii. 5; Amos ix. 11; Micah v. 1; Zech. xii. 8.

[31] The words, qui orietur ex semine David, are indeed wanting in the Latin translation, but are to be regarded as original according to the unanimous testimony of the Oriental versions.

[32] For later Judaism, comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 86–147. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, pp. 169–171. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 292–300. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 437 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 666 sq.). Castelli, *Il Messia secondo gli Ebrei*, pp. 202–215.

*David.*[33] *Subsequently* the hope was consolidated and raised more and more into the expectation of *a personal Messiah* as a ruler endowed by God with special gifts and powers. In the time of Christ this form had at all events long been the prevailing one. But this naturally implies that the picture would more and more acquire superhuman features. The more exceptional the position awarded to the Messiah, the more does He Himself step forth from ordinary human limits. In the freedom with which the religious circle of ideas moved, this was effected in a very different fashion. In general however *the Messiah was thought of as a human king and ruler, but as one endowed by God with special gifts and powers.* This is especially evident in the Solomonian Psalter. He here appears as altogether a human king (xvii. 23, 47), but a righteous one (xvii. 35), free from sin and holy (xvii. 41, 46), endowed by the Holy Ghost with power, wisdom and righteousness (xvii. 42). It is the same view, only briefly expressed, which designates him as ἁγνὸς ἄναξ (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 49). Elsewhere, on the other hand, even pre-existence is ascribed to him, and his whole appearing raised more to the superhuman. So especially in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch.[34] It must not indeed be reckoned in this respect, that he is, as already mentioned, called the Son of God. For the official predicate tells us nothing at all of His nature; nor does His designation in Enoch as the Son of man of itself tell us anything. The whole view of His person is however in both the above-named works one essentially super-

Weber, *System der altsynagogalen paläst. Theologie*, p. 339 ff. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.*, art. "Messias," pp. 738–765.

[33] The promise of a king of David's house "for ever" means, in the first place, only that the *dynasty* should not die out. Thus *e.g.* the Maccabean Simon was chosen by the people as ruler and high priest "for ever" (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, 1 Macc. xiv. 41), *i.e.* the government and high-priesthood were declared hereditary in his family.

[34] Comp. Hellwag, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1848, pp. 151–160.

natural. In the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch, it is said of Him: He was (before his manifestation on earth) hidden and kept with God (xlvi. 1, 2, lxii. 7). His name was named before the Lord of spirits, before the sun and the signs were created, before the stars were made (xlviii. 3).[35] He was chosen and was hidden with God *before the world was created*, and will be with Him to eternity (xlviii. 6). His countenance is as the appearance of a man, and full of grace, *like one of the holy angels* (xlvi. 1). It is he, who has righteousness, with whom righteousness dwells, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is concealed, because the Lord of spirits has chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of spirits has surpassed everything through uprightness for ever (xlvi. 3). His glory is from eternity to eternity, and his power from generation to generation. In him dwells the spirit of wisdom, and the spirit of Him who gives knowledge, and the spirit of instruction and strength, and the spirit of those who have fallen asleep in righteousness. And he will judge the hidden things, and no one will be able to hold vain discourse before him, for he is chosen before the Lord of spirits according to his good pleasure (xlix. 2–4). In essential agreement with this are the expressions of the *fourth Book of Ezra*. Compare especially xii. 32: Hic est Unctus, quem reservavit Altissimus in finem; and xiii. 24: Ipse est, quem conservat Altissimus multis temporibus. As his pre-existence is here expressly taught, so is it presupposed when it is promised to Ezra, that after his admission into heaven he will return with the Messiah (tu enim recipieris ab hominibus, et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis, usquequo finiantur tempora). And quite in accordance with Enoch is his pre-existence designated as a state of concealment with God (xiii. 52): Sicut non potest hoc vel scrutinare vel scire quis, quid sit in

[35] Comp. Targum Jonathan on Zech. iv. 7: The Messiah *whose name was named before eternity.*

profundo maris, sic non poterit quisque super terram videre filium meum, vel eos qui cum eo sunt, nisi in tempore dici. It has been in many respects attempted, but hardly with justice, to refer this entire series of thought to Christian influences. It is indeed perfectly comprehensible from Old Testament premises. Such expressions as Micah v. 2, that the origins of Messiah are from of old, from the days of eternity (מִקֶּדֶם מִימֵי עוֹלָם), might easily be understood in the sense of a pre-existence from eternity. Besides, the passage Dan. vii. 13–14 need only be understood of the person of the Messiah and taken literally, and the doctrine of the pre-existence is already stated. For it is self-evident, that he who comes down from heaven, was before in heaven. This view was favoured by the fact that the whole course of the development tended towards the notion, that everything truly valuable previously existed in heaven.[86] On the other hand, many traces show that post-Christian Judaism, far from elevating the person of the Messiah, under Christian influence to the supernatural, strongly emphasized the human side in opposition to Christianity We need only recall the saying in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, c. 49: *πάντες ἡμεῖς τὸν Χριστὸν ἄνθρωπον ἐξ ἀνθρώπων προσδοκῶμεν γενήσεσθαι.* And akin with this is a Talmudic passage *Jer. Taanith* ii. 1 (given by Oehler, ix. 437, 2nd ed. 667): "R. Abbahu said: If a man says to thee—I am God, he lies; I am the Son of man, he will at last repent it; I ascend to heaven, if he said it he will not prove it." Thus it was just the humanity upon which post-Christian Judaism strongly insisted. And so much the less cause have we to refer the view of the pre-existence to Christian influence.

Concerning the *time* of Messiah's appearing the later Rabbis

[86] See above, p. 134, and Harnack on Hermas, *Vis.* ii. 4. 1 (according to Hermas the Christian Church was pre-existent). In the Old Testament a heavenly model of the tabernacle and its vessels is already assumed (Ex. xxv. 9, 40, xxvi. 30, xxvii. 8; Num. viii. 4).

made all manner of ingenious computations.[37] The view *that the present world would last six thousand years*, corresponding to the six days of creation, because one day is with God as a thousand years, seems to have been pretty widely disseminated.[38] But the date of the advent of Messiah seems under this presupposition to have been very variously computed, according as his days were identified with the future עוֹלָם or still reckoned in the present עוֹלָם (comp. below, No. 9). According to the former and older view, the Messianic period would begin after the lapse of the sixth thousand (so Barnabas, Irenaeus and others). On the latter supposition (that the days of the Messiah belonged to the present עוֹלָם), the present course of the world was divided into three periods: 2000 years without law, 2000 years under the law, and 2000 years of the Messianic period. According to this computation the time appointed for the Messiah's advent had already arrived, but he could not yet appear because of the transgressions of the people.[39] This latter was, at least in rigidly legal circles, the general view: *the Messiah cannot come until the people repent and perfectly fulfil the law.* "If all Israel would together repent for a whole day, the redemption by Messiah would ensue." If Israel would only keep two Sabbaths properly, we should be immediately redeemed.[40]

The manner of Messiah's advent is represented as sudden, all at once he is there and appears as a victorious ruler. As on the other hand it is assumed, that he is born as a child in Bethlehem, the two views are combined by the admission, that he will at first live in concealment and then *suddenly come*

[37] *Sanhedrin* 96b–97a, fully given in Delitzsch's *Commentar zum Briefe an die Hebräer*, pp. 762–764, and in Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 297 sqq. Comp. Weber, *System*, p. 334 sq.

[38] *Barnabas*, c. 15; Irenaeus, v. 28. 3, and Hilgenfeld's and Harnack's notes to *Barnabas*, c. 15.

[39] See Delitzsch and Weber as above (*Sanhedrin* 97a; *Aboda sara* 9a).

[40] See Weber, *System*, p. 333 sq.

*forth from concealment.*[41] Therefore the Jews say in John vii. 27: ὁ Χριστὸς ὅταν ἔρχηται, οὐδεὶς γινώσκει πόθεν ἐστίν. And in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* it is just on this account that the possibility, that Messiah may have already been born, is left open to the representative of the Jewish view.[42] It is related in the Jerusalem Talmud, that the Messiah was born on the day the temple was destroyed, but some time after carried away from his mother by a tempest.[43] In the Targum on Micah iv. 8 also, it is assumed that he is already present, but *still concealed*, and that *because of the sins of the people.* In later writers is found the view that he would proceed from Rome.[44] The belief that he would at his advent authenticate himself by *miracles* was universal (Matt. xi. 4 sqq.; Luke vii. 22 sqq.; John vii. 31).

4. *Last attack of the hostile powers.*[45] After the appearing of the Messiah, the heathen powers will assemble against him for a last attack. This expectation too was suggested by Old Testament passages, especially by Dan. xi. It is very plainly expressed *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 663 sqq. and 4 Ezra xiii. 33 sqq., also in Enoch xc. 16, only that here it is not an attack against Messiah, but against the people of God. It is frequently held, that this last attack takes place under the

[41] Comp. Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on John vii. 27. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 223–225. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 438 (2nd ed. ix. 668). Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 293 sq. Weber, *System*, p. 342 sqq.

[42] *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 8: Χριστὸς δὲ εἰ καὶ γεγένηται καὶ ἔστι που, ἀγνωστός ἐστι καὶ οὐδὲ αὐτός πω ἑαυτὸν ἐπίσταται οὐδὲ ἔχει δύναμίν τινα. *Ibid.* c. 110: εἰ δὲ καὶ ἐληλυθέναι λέγουσιν, οὐ γινώσκεται ὅς ἐστιν, ἀλλ' ὅταν ἐμφανὴς καὶ ἔνδοξος γένηται, τότε γνωσθήσεται ὅς ἐστι, φασί.

[43] See the whole passage in Lightfoot's *Horae* on Matt. ii. 1. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 279 sq.

[44] *Targum Jerushalmi* on Ex. xiii. 42 and *Bab. Sanhedrin* 98ª. The latter passage is given in Delitzsch's *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, p. 117, and in Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias* (1870), p. 57 sq.

[45] See Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, pp. 296–308. For the O. T. Herm. Schultz, *Alttestamentliche Theologie* (2nd ed. 1878), p. 696.

leadership of a chief adversary of the Messiah, of an "Antichrist" (the name is in the N. T. in the Johannean Epistles, 1 John ii. 18, 22, iv. 3; 2 John 7; the thing in Apoc. Baruch c. 40; 2 Thess. ii.; Rev. xiii.).[46] In later Rabbinic authorities the enigmatical name Armilus (ארמילוס) occurs for this chief adversary of the people of Israel.[47] The reappearance of Gog and Magog is also expected on the ground of Ezek. xxxviii.–xxxix., but as a rule not till after the close of the Messianic kingdom, as a last manifestation of the ungodly powers (Rev. xx. 8, 9).[48]

5. *Destruction of the hostile powers.*[49] The destruction of the hostile powers takes place according to Old Testament prediction by means of a great judgment, inflicted by God Himself upon His adversaries.[50] This view is most faithfully adhered to in the *Assumptio Mosis*, the tenth chapter of which in many respects recalls Joel chaps. iii. and iv. Closely akin to it is the statement in the groundwork of the Book of Enoch, inasmuch as here too God Himself destroys the power of the heathen nations (xc. 18, 19) and then sits in judgment, at which judgment however only the fallen and disobedient angels and the apostate Israelites (the blinded sheep) are

[46] Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 69–74. Gesenius, art. "Antichrist," in Ersch and Gruber's *Enc.* sec. i. vol. iv. (1820) p. 292 sq. Hausrath in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* i. 137 sq. Kähler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. i. 446 sqq. For the history of the Christian doctrine, the chief work is Malvenda, *De Antichristo*, Romae 1604.

[47] Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 221–224, *s.v.* ארמילוס. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum* (1700), ii. 704–715. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 72 sq. (art. "Armilus"). Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 239 sqq. Zunz, *Die gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden*, p. 282, also pp. 130, 140.

[48] Comp. *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 319 sqq., 512 sqq. Mishna, *Edujoth* ii. 10. The commentaries on Rev. xx. 8, 9. The articles on Gog and Magog in the Bible Dictionaries (Schenkel, Winer, Riehm) and in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. v. 263–265. Uhlemann on Gog and Magog (*Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1862, pp. 265–286). Renan, *L'Antichrist.* Weber, *System*, p. 396 sqq.

[49] Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 232–234.

[50] See in general, Knobel, *Der Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i. 325 sq.

condemned (xc. 20–27), while the heathen nations submit to the people of God (xc. 30). The Messiah, who is altogether absent in the *Assumptio Mosis*, here first appears *after* the judgment (xc. 37). It is common to both, that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. The ordinary notion however was, that the Messiah would destroy the hostile powers. Already in the oldest Sibyllist (iii. 652 sqq.) he appears "to put an end to all war upon earth, killing some and fulfilling the promises given to others." In Philo (*De praem. et poen.* § 16) it is said of him, that he "takes the field and makes war and will subdue great and populous nations." Still more clearly does he appear in the *Psalterium Salomonis* as the conqueror of the heathen adversaries of God's people, and it is here specially noteworthy, that he overthrows his enemies by the mere word of his mouth (ἐν λόγῳ στόματος αὐτοῦ, according to Isa. xi. 4). In entire agreement with these older types is the destruction of the heathen world-powers represented in the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Esdras as the first act of the Messiah, when he appears (Apoc. Baruch xxxix. 7–xl. 2, lxx. 9, lxxii. 2–6; 4 Ezra xii. 32, 33, xiii. 27, 28, xxxv.–xxxviii.). The only difference is, that, according to the fourth Book of Ezra, this destruction results from a sentence of God's anointed (xiii. 28: *non tenebut framcam neque vas bellicosum*; xiii. 28: *perdet eos sine labore per legem*), while in the Apocalypse of Baruch although forensic forms are spoken of, yet weapons of war are also mentioned (the former xl. 1, 2, the latter lxxii. 6). Still more decidedly than in the fourth Book of Ezra, is the judgment of the Messiah upon an ungodly world described as purely forensic in the figurative addresses in the Book of Enoch. One might indeed feel tempted to ascribe to this book also the view of a war of extermination, since it is said of the Son of man, chap. xlvi. 4–6, that he stirs up the kings and the mighty ones from their beds, loosens the bridles of the powerful and

breaks the teeth of sinners; that he thrusts kings from their thrones and out of their kingdoms, and (lii. 4–9) that nothing on earth is able to resist his power. "There will be no iron for war, nor coat of mail; brass will be of no avail, and tin will be of no avail and will be of no esteem, and lead will not be desired." But in other places it is repeatedly said, that the elect, the Son of man, will sit upon the throne of His glory to judge men and angels (xlv. 3, lv. 4, lxix. 27, lxi. 8, 9). In the chief passage also, chap. lxii., the judgment is described in purely forensic forms. The Lord of spirits sits upon the throne of his glory (lxii. 2), and the Son of the woman, the Son of man, sits upon the throne of his glory (lxii. 5 sqq.). And the kings and mighty ones of the earth are struck when they see him with fear and terror, and extol and praise and supplicate him, and entreat mercy from him (lxii. 4–9). But the Lord of spirits will reject them, so that they will speedily flee before his face, and their faces be filled with shame. And the avenging angels will receive them, to exercise retribution upon them, for having ill-treated his children and his elect (lxii. 10, 11). Finally, we again find in the Targums the view, that the Messiah overcomes his enemies in battle, as a mighty hero. So in Jonathan on Isa. x. 27: "The nations are crushed by the Messiah;" and especially in Pseudo-Jonathan and Jerushalmi on Gen. xlix. 11: "How beautiful is King Messiah, who will proceed from the house of Judah. He girds his loins and enters the field and sets the battle in array against his foes and kills kings." We just see from all this, that the general idea of a destruction of the anti-godly powers by the Messiah is fashioned very variously as to its particulars.[51] Not till after the destruction

[51] In a passage of the Babylonian Talmud (*Sukka* 52[a]) and frequently afterwards, the destruction of the hostile powers is represented not as the task of the Messiah proper, but as that of a subordinate Messiah, of "Messiah the son of Joseph" (משיח בן יוסף). He is also called "Messiah the son of Ephraim," and is therefore the Messiah of the ten tribes, and

of the ungodly can the Messianic age appear. For "as long as there are sinners in the world, so long does the wrath of God endure, but as they disappear from the world the divine wrath also vanishes." [52]

6. *Renovation of Jerusalem.*[53] Since the Messianic kingdom is to be set up in the Holy Land (comp. *e.g.* 4 Ezra ix. 9), Jerusalem itself must first of all be renovated. This was however expected in diverse manners. In the simplest it was regarded only as a purification of the holy city, especially "from the heathen, who now tread it under foot" (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 25, 33). After the destruction of Jerusalem it took the form of a rebuilding and indeed of a rebuilding "to an eternal building" (*Shemoneh Esreh*, 14th Berachah). With this is however found the view, that already in the pre-Messianic time a far more glorious Jerusalem than the earthly exists with God in heaven, and that this will, at the commencement of the Messianic age, descend to earth. The Old Testament foundation for this hope is especially Ezek. xl.–xlviii., also Isa. liv. 11 sqq., lx.; Hag. ii. 7–9; Zech. ii. 6–17; the new Jerusalem described in these passages being conceived of as now already existing in heaven. This ἄνω Ἰερουσαλήμ (Gal. iv. 26), Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐπουράνιος (Heb. xii. 22) καινὴ Ἰερουσαλήμ (Rev. iii. 12,

has only the comparatively subordinate task of fighting against the ungodly powers, in which fight he will fall, while the Messiah, the son of David, will set up the kingdom of glory. Compare on this very recent view, Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 75–81. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 258 sqq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 440 (2nd ed. ix. 669 sq.). Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias*, pp. 109–121. Castelli, *Il Messia*, pp. 224–236, 342 sqq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 356 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 346 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 767–770 (art. "Messias Sohn Joseph").

[52] Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 6, *fin.*

[53] Comp. Schoettgen, *De Hierosolyma coelesti* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1205–1248). Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, p. 199 sq. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Gal. iv. 26. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 839 sqq. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 217–221. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 245 sqq., 308. Weber, *System*, p. 356 sqq.

xxi. 2, 10) is also, as is well known, often spoken of in the New Testament; comp. also *Test. Dan.* c. v.: ἡ νέα Ἰερουσαλήμ. According to the Apocalypse of Baruch, this heavenly Jerusalem was originally in Paradise before Adam sinned. But when he transgressed the command of God, it was taken from him, as was also Paradise, and preserved in heaven. It was afterwards shown in a vision of the night to Abraham, and also to Moses upon Mount Sinai (Apoc. Baruch iv. 2–6). Ezra too saw it in a vision (4 Ezra x. 44–59). This new and glorious Jerusalem is then to appear on earth in the place of the old one, which it will far surpass in pomp and beauty, Enoch liii. 6, xc. 28, 29; 4 Ezra vii. 26. Comp. also Apoc. Baruch xxxii. 4.

7. *Gathering of the Dispersed.*[54] That the dispersed of Israel would share in the Messianic kingdom, and for this purpose return to Palestine, was so self-evident, that this hope would have been cherished even without the definite predictions of the Old Testament. The *Psalterium Salomonis* (Ps. xi.) poetically describes how the dispersed of Israel will assemble from the west and east, from the north and from the Isles, and come to Jerusalem. The Greek Book of Baruch expresses a partly verbal agreement with the *Psalt. Sal.* (iv. 36, 37, v. 5–9). Philo sees the dispersed under the leadership of a divine appearance coming from all quarters to Jerusalem (*De exsecrationibus*, § 8–9). The prediction too of Isaiah, that the heathen nations shall themselves bring the dispersed as an offering to the temple (Isa. xlix. 22, lx. 4, 9, lxvi. 20) reappears in the *Psalt. Salom.* (xvii. 34), while the gathering is at the same time described as the work of the Messiah (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 28. Jonathan on Jerem. xxxiii. 13). According to the fourth Book of Ezra, the ten tribes departed

[54] Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 235–238. The sequence is: (1) the renovation of Jerusalem; (2) the gathering of the Dispersed, according to the *Sohar* in Gfrörer, ii. 217, above.

into a hitherto uninhabited country called Azareth (so the Latin version) or Arzaph (*finis mundi*, so the Syrian), that they might there observe their laws.[55] Thence will they return at the commencement of the Messianic period, and the Most High will dry up the sources of the Euphrates, that they may pass over (4 Ezra xiii. 39–47). With this universal hope of the gathering of the dispersed, it is striking, that the return of the ten tribes is altogether doubted by individuals like R. Akiba.[56] From the daily prayer however of the Shemoneh Esreh: "Lift up a banner to gather our dispersed and assemble us from the four ends of the earth," it is seen that such doubts were confined to individuals.

8. *The kingdom of glory in Palestine.* The Messianic kingdom will indeed have the Messianic King at its head, but its supreme ruler is God Himself (comp. *e.g. Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 704–706, 717, 756–759; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 1, 38, 51; *Shemoneh Esreh*, 11th Berachah. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 1). *With the setting up of this kingdom, the idea of God's kingship over Israel becomes full reality and truth.* God is indeed already the King of Israel. He does not however exercise His kingship to its full extent, but on the contrary temporarily exposes His people to the heathen world-powers, to chastise them for their sins. In the glorious future kingdom He again takes the government into His own hand. Hence

[55] Azareth=ארץ אחרת, *terra alia* (4 Ezra xiii. 40); the Hebrew expression in Deut. xxix. 27, which passage is in the Mishna referred to the ten tribes (see the next note). This undoubtedly correct explanation was first given by Schiller-Szinessy (*Journal of Philology*, vol. iii. 1870), and afterwards by Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (1875), p. 23, note.

[56] *Sanhedrin* x. 3, *fin.*: "The ten tribes never more return, for it is said of them (Deut. xxix. 27): He will cast them into another land as this day. Hence as this day passes away and does not return, so shall they pass away and not return. So R. Akiba. But R. Elieser says: As the day grows darker and then light again, so will it some day be light again with the ten tribes, with whom it is now dark."

it is called in contrast to the heathen kingdoms, *the kingdom of God* (*βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ*, in the New Testament, especially in Mark and Luke. *Sibyll.* iii. 47, 48: *βασιλεία μεγίστη ἀθανάτου βασιλῆος*. Comp. *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 4; *Assumptio Mosis* x. 1, 3). Of similar meaning is the expression occurring in Matthew, *βασιλεία τῶν οὐρανῶν*, "kingdom of heaven."[57] For "heaven" here is, according to a very current Jewish expression, a metonymy for God. It is the kingdom, which is governed not by earthly powers, but by heaven.[58]

[57] Comp. on this expression, Schoettgen, *De regno coelorum* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1147–1152). Lightfoot, *Horae* on Matt. iii. 2. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. iii. 2. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 187–192. De Wette, *Biblische Dogmatik*, pp. 175–177. Tholuck, *Bergpredigt*, p. 66 sq. Fritzsche, *Evangelium Matthaei*, p. 109 sqq. (where still more literature is given). Kuinoel on Matt. iii. 2. The Commentaries in general on Matt. iii. 2. Wichelhaus, *Commentar zu der Leidensgeschichte* (1855), p. 284 sqq. Keim, *Gesch. Jesu*, ii. 33 sqq. Schürer, *Der Begriff des Himmelreiches aus jüdischen Quellen erläutert* (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, pp. 166–187). Cremer, *Bibl.-theol. Wörterb. s.v. βασιλεία*. Also *Theol. Litztg.* 1883, p. 581.

[58] I have shown in the article quoted (*Jahrb. für prot. Theol.* 1876, p. 166 sqq.) how current this metonymy was in Judaism in the time of Christ. The formula מַלְכוּת שָׁמַיִם in particular frequently occurs, certainly not as a rule with the meaning of "kingdom of heaven," but as *abstractum* "the kingship, the government of heaven," *i.e.* the rule of God (*e.g.* Mishna, *Berachoth* ii. 2, 5). But just here there can be no doubt that שמים stands metonymically for "God." So much the stranger is it, to dispute the correctness of this meaning, where *βασιλεία* stands as *concretum* (with the signification "kingdom"); for the genitive *τῶν οὐρανῶν* remains the same, whether *βασιλεία* means "the kingship," or "the kingdom." If accidentally the expression מלכות שמים, not meaning "the kingdom of heaven," should occur in Rabbinic literature, this would be sufficiently explained by the fact that the Rabbis seldom speak of the "kingdom of God" at all. They say instead "the days of Messiah" or "the עולם to come," or the like. It seems however, that the expression does nevertheless occur with the meaning in question, so especially *Pesikta* (ed. Buber) p. 51[a]: הגיע זמנה של מלכות הרשעה שתעקר מן העולם, הגיע זמנה של מלכות שמים שתגלה, "The time of the ungodly *Malkuth* is come, that it should be rooted out of the world; the time of the *Malkuth* of heaven is come, that it should be revealed." The same passage also in *Midrash rabba* on the Song of Solomon (in Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb. s.v.* מלכות). Comp. also Weber, *System*, p. 349. Cremer, *Biblisch-theol. Wörterb. s.v. βασιλεία* (3rd ed. p. 162).

*The Holy Land* forms the *central point* of this kingdom. Hence "to inherit the land" is equivalent to having part in the Messianic kingdom.[59] But it is not confined to the limits of Palestine; on the contrary, it is as a rule conceived of as in some way or other comprising the whole world.[60] Already, in the Old Testament, it was predicted that the Gentiles too should acknowledge the God of Israel as the supreme Judge (Isa. ii. 2 sqq.; Micah iv. 1 sqq., vii. 16 sq.), be converted to Him (Isa. xlii. 1–6, xlix. 6, li. 4, 5; Jer. iii. 17, xvi. 19 sq.; Zeph. ii. 11, iii. 9; Zech. viii. 20 sqq.), and be consequently admitted into the theocracy (Isa. lv. 5, lvi. 1 sqq.; Jer. xii. 14; Zech. ii. 15), so that Jahveh is King over the whole earth (Zech. xiv. 9) and the Messiah a banner for all nations (Isa. xi. 10). Most decidedly is power over all the kingdoms of the world promised in the Book of Daniel to the saints of the Most High (Dan. ii. 14, vii. 14, 27). This hope was also stedfastly adhered to by later Judaism, though in a different manner. According to the Sibyllines the heathen, when they see the quiet and peace of God's people, will of themselves come to reason, and praise and celebrate the only true God, send gifts to His temple and walk after His laws (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 698–726). Then will God set up a kingdom over all men, in which the prophets of God are judges and righteous kings (iii. 766–783). According to Philo the pious and virtuous receive the rule over the world, because they possess the three qualities, which especially make men competent to be rulers, viz. *σεμνότης*, *δεινότης* and *ἐνέργεια*. And other men submit to them through *αἰδώς* or *φόβος* or *εὔνοια* (*De praem. et poen.* § 16). Elsewhere the rule of the saints appears more as one founded on power. The heathen do homage to the Messiah, because they perceive

[59] *Kiddushin* i. 10. Comp. Matt. v. 5 (ed. Tischendorf, v. 4).

[60] See Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 219 sq., 238–242. Weber, *System*, p. 364 sqq.

that God has given him power (Enoch xc. 30, 37. *Figurative addresses*, xlviii. 5, liii. 1; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 32–35; *Sibyll.* iii. 49: *ἀγνὸς ἄναξ πάσης γῆς σκῆπτρα κρατήσων.* Apoc. Baruch lxxii. 5. Targum on Zech. iv. 7: The Messiah will rule over all kingdoms). This notion comes forward in the most one-sided form in the *Assumptio Mosis*, whose author desires nothing more ardently, than that Israel should tread upon the neck of the eagle (x. 8: tunc felix eris tu Istrahel, *et ascendes supra cervices et alas aquilae*). According to the *Book of Jubilees* (Ewald's *Jahrb.* vol. iii. p. 42) it was already promised to Jacob, that kings should go forth from him, who should rule, wherever the children of men had trodden. "And I will give unto thy seed the whole earth, which is under heaven, and they shall rule at their pleasure over all nations, and afterwards they shall draw to themselves the whole earth and inherit it for ever" (comp. also Rom. iv. 13, and its expositors, especially Wetzstein).

The Messianic period is moreover described, and that mostly on the ground of Old Testament passages, as one of joy and gladness.[61] All war, strife, discord and quarrels shall cease, and peace, righteousness, love and faithfulness prevail upon earth (*Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 371–380, 751–760. Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 16; Apoc. Baruch lxxiii. 4, 5). The wild beasts also will lose their enmity to man and serve him (*Sibyll.* iii. 620–623, 743–750; Apoc. Baruch xxix. 5–8). Wealth and prosperity will prevail among men (Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 17–18). The age of man will increase to near upon a thousand years, and yet men will neither be old nor weary of life, but like children and youths ("Jubilees" in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 24). All will rejoice in bodily health and strength. Women will bring forth without pain, and the reaper will not

[61] Comp. Knobel, *Prophetismus der Hebräer*, i. 321 sqq. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 242–252. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* p. 770 sqq. (art. "Messiaszeit").

weary at his work (Philo, *De praem. et poen.* § 20. Apoc. Baruch lxxiii. 2, 3, 7, lxxiv. 1).[62]

These external blessings are not however the only ones. On the contrary, they result from the fact, that the Messianic Church is a holy nation, which God has sanctified, and which the Messiah governs in righteousness. He suffers no unrighteousness to remain in its midst, and there is not a man in it who knows wickedness. There is no unrighteousness among His people, for they are all holy (*Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 28, 29, 36, 48, 49, xviii. 9, 10). Life in the Messianic kingdom is a continual *λατρεύειν θεῷ ἐν ὁσιότητι καὶ δικαιοσύνῃ ἐνώπιον αὐτοῦ* (Luke i. 74, 75). And the rule of Messiah over the heathen world is by no means conceived of as resting only on power, but frequently in such wise, that he is a light to the Gentiles (Isa. xlii. 6, xlix. 6, li. 4; Enoch xlviii. 4; Luke ii. 32. Comp. especially the already mentioned passages of the Sibyllines, iii. 710–726). An Israelite being unable to conceive of a *λατρεύειν θεῷ* otherwise than in the form of the *temple worship and the observance of the law*, it is in truth self-evident, that these are not to cease in the Messianic kingdom. In fact this is at least the prevailing view.[63] Hence after the destruction of the temple the daily prayer of the Israelite is for the restoration of the sacrificial ritual (עֲבוֹדָה).[64]

In this glorious future kingdom not only the dispersed

[62] Sometimes this future glory is also represented under the figure of a feast (סְעֻדָּה), which God prepares for the righteous. See Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenthum*, ii. 872–889. Corrodi, *Kritische Geschichte des Chiliasmus*, i. 329 sqq. Bertholdt, *De Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 196–199. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* p. 1312 sqq. (art. "Zukunftsmahl"). Comp. Matt. viii. 11; Luke xiii. 29.

[63] For farther particulars, see Weber, *System*, p. 359 sqq. Castelli, *Il Messia*, p. 277 sqq.

[64] *Shemoneh Esreh*, 17th Berachah (see above, p. 87). Comp. also the Passover liturgy, *Pesachim* x. 6.

members of the nation, but also all *deceased Israelites* are to participate. They will come forth from their graves to enjoy, with those of their fellow-countrymen who are then living, the happiness of Messiah's kingdom.[65]

The eschatological expectations of many terminate with this hope of a kingdom of glory in Palestine, seeing its duration is conceived of as everlasting. As Old Testament prophecy had promised to the people of Israel that they should dwell in the land for ever (Jer. xxiv. 6; Ezek. xxxvii. 25; Joel iv. 20), that David's throne should never be vacant (Jer. xxxiii. 17, 22), and David should always be the king of Israel (Ezek. xxxvii. 25), and as, especially in the Book of Daniel, the kingdom of the saints of the Most High is designated an everlasting one (מַלְכוּת עָלַם, Dan. vii. 27), so also is eternal duration frequently ascribed to the Messianic kingdom by later writers (*Sibyll.* iii. 766; *Psalt. Salom.* xvii. 4; *Sibyll.* iii. 49–50; Enoch lxii. 14). Hence too the Jews say in John xii. 34: *Ἡμεῖς ἠκούσαμεν ἐκ τοῦ νόμου ὅτι ὁ Χριστὸς μένει εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα*, showing that this view was also current in later Jewish theology.[66] Subsequently however the glory of the Messianic kingdom was regarded as not ultimate and

[65] Stähelin (*Jahrb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 199 sqq.) does not seem to me right in keeping the *Messianic hope* and the *hope of a resurrection* as far apart as possible, nay in supposing that there was originally no connection between them. In Dan. xii. 2 and *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16 this connection is unmistakeable. For if in both passages it is said that the just shall rise "to eternal life," this life can, according to the sphere of thought in both books, mean only life in the Messianic kingdom. The two books know nothing of any other *ζωή*. Comp. also Enoch li. 1–5. The course of development too seems to me just the reverse of that, which Stähelin lays down. The hope of a resurrection and the Messianic hope were not originally independent of, and subsequently combined with, each other. But, on the contrary, from the hope of sharing in the Messianic kingdom, first arose the hope of a bodily resurrection, and afterwards life during Messiah's reign and *ζωὴ αἰώνιος* were separated the one from the other.

[66] Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, p. 155 sq.

supreme, but a still higher and heavenly happiness was expected after it, and hence a *duration bounded by time*,[67] the measure of which is fully discussed in the Talmud,[68] was ascribed to the reign of the Messiah. The Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, among the more ancient monuments, hold this view the most decidedly. It is indeed said of the Messiah in the former, c. lxxiii. 1, that He sits *in aeternum* super throno regni sui. But what is meant by this is seen from another passage, c. xl. 3: Et erit principatus ejus stans *in saeculum, donec finiatur mundus corruptionis.* Hence the rule of Messiah lasts only as long as this transitory world. Similarly it is said in the fourth Book of Ezra (xii. 34), that He will redeem and revive the people of God *quoadusque veniat finis, dies judicii.* Still farther detail is given in the chief passage, vii. 28, 29: Jocundabuntur, qui relicti sunt, *annis quadragentis.* Et erit post annos hos, et morietur filius meus Christus et omnes qui spiramentum habent homines.[69] The duration of Messiah's kingdom is by others, and also in the above-named passage of the Talmud (*Sanhedrin* 99[a]), computed at 400 years. From it we also learn that this computation rests upon Gen. xv. 13 (the bondage in Egypt lasted 400 years) compared with Ps. xc. 15: "Make us glad according to the days wherein Thou hast afflicted us and the years wherein we have seen evil." Thus the time of happiness is to last as long as the time of affliction. A different calculation is presupposed in the Revelation, the duration being stated at 1000 years, according to the saying in the Psalm, that one day is with God as a thousand years (Rev. xx. 4–6). This computation also is mentioned in the

[67] Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 252–256. Renan, *L'Antichrist.* Weber, *System*, p. 355 sq. Drummond, pp. 312–318.

[68] *Sanhedrin* 99[a], in Gfrörer, ii. 252 sqq. More fully (*Sanhedrin* 96[b]–99[a]) in Castelli, p. 297 sqq.

[69] The Latin and Arabic translations have the number 400, the Syrian 30. In the Ethiopic and Armenian the number is altogether wanting.

Talmud.[70] We see then, that wherever only a temporal duration is ascribed to the kingdom of the Messiah, a renovation of the world and the last judgment are expected at the end of this period.

9. *Renovation of the world.*[71] The hope of a renovation of heaven and earth is chiefly based on Isa. lxv. 17, lxvi. 22 (comp. also Matt. xix. 28; Rev. xxi. 1; 2 Pet. iii. 13). Accordingly a distinction is made between a *present* and a *future* world, הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה and הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא,[72] in the New Testament frequently: ὁ αἰὼν οὗτος and ὁ αἰὼν ὁ μέλλων or ὁ ἐρχόμενος (*e.g.* Matt. xii. 32; Mark x. 30; Luke xviii. 30). But a difference of view arose, inasmuch as some made the new world appear with the beginning of Messiah's reign, while others placed it after its conclusion. The former is found *e.g.* in the figurative discourses of the Book of Enoch (c. xlv. 4, 5), "And at that day I will let my elect dwell among you and will change the heaven and make it an eternal blessing and light. And I will transform the earth and make it a blessing, and cause my elect to dwell in it" (comp. also xci. 16). The

[70] *Sanhedrin* 97a. Comp. Gfrörer, ii. 254. Castelli, p. 300. Drummond, p. 317. Delitzsch, *Commentar zum Hebräerbrief*, p. 763.

[71] Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, p. 213 sq. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 272–275. The Rabbinic *terminus technicus* therefore is חִדּוּשׁ הָעוֹלָם, Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 711. Comp. Matt. xix. 28: παλιγγενεσία.

[72] Mishna, *Berachoth* i. 5; *Peah* i. 1; *Kiddushin* iv. 14; *Baba mezia* ii. 11; *Sanhedrin* x. 1–4; *Aboth* ii. 7, iv. 1, 16, 17, v. 19; *Apocal. Baruch* xliv. 15, xlviii. 50, lxxiii. 5; 4 Ezra vi. 9, vii. 12, 13, 42, 43, viii. 1. Comp. Rhenferdius, *De saeculo futuro* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 1116–1171). Witsius, *De saeculo hoc et futuro* (Meuschen, *Nov. Test.* pp. 1171–1183). Schoettgen, *De saeculo hoc et futuro* (*Horae Hebraicae*, i. 1153–1158). Lightfoot, *Horae Hebraicae* on Matt. xii. 32. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. xii. 32. Koppe, *Nov. Test.* vol. vi., *epist. ad Ephes. Exc.* i. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 38–43. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 212–217. Bleek, *Hebräerbrief*, ii. 1, 20 sqq. Riehm, *Lehrbegriff des Hebräerbriefes*, i. 204 sqq. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 434 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 664 sq.). Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1866, p. 124. Weber, *System*, p. 354 sq.

latter in the fourth Book of Ezra, according to which, after the conclusion of the Messianic period, a deathlike silence of seven days takes place upon earth, which is followed by the dawn of the new and the setting of the old world (vii. 30, 31). According to these different views the Messianic period is either identified with the future or reckoned as belonging to the present world. The former, *e.g.* in the Targum of Jonathan on 1 Kings iv. 33: "The future world of the Messiah" (עַלְמָא דְאָתֵי דְמְשִׁיחָא), and Mishna, *Berachoth* i. 5, where the present world (הָעוֹלָם הַזֶּה) and the days of the Messiah (יְמוֹת הַמָּשִׁיחַ) are opposed to each other, and therefore the latter identified with הָעוֹלָם הַבָּא. In the fourth Book of Ezra, on the contrary, the days of the Messiah are reckoned to the present world, and the future world does not begin till the last judgment, which follows the close of the Messianic period (see especially vii. 42, 43, with which indeed vi. 9 is not easily reconcilable). The book *Sifre* also distinguishes between "the days of the Messiah" and "the future world."[73] The older and original view is in any case, that which identifies the days of Messiah with the future עוֹלָם. For the "future course of the world" is in the first place nothing else than the future happy Messianic period (so too in the New Testament). It was not till a higher, a heavenly happiness was hoped for after the close of the Messianic kingdom, that the Messianic period was reckoned as belonging to the present *Olam*, and the renovation of the world not expected to take place till that period had ended. In later Jewish theology this view became the prevailing one (for particulars, see the literature named note 72). Sometimes a position between this world and the world to come is assigned to the Messianic period. This is already found in the Apocalypse of Baruch, lxxiv. 2, 3: Tempus illud (the Messianic time) finis est illius quod corrumpitur, et initium illius quod non corrum-

[73] See Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, 1866, p. 124.

pitur. . . . Ideo longe est a malis, et prope iis quae non moriuntur.

10. *The general resurrection.*[74] A general resurrection of the dead is to take place before the last judgment. So great a variety of views with respect to this point, however, prevails in Jewish theology, that it would lead us too far to enter into details.[75] Only the chief points can here be alluded to. The belief in a resurrection or reanimation of the dead (תְּחִיַּת הַמֵּתִים),[76] which is clearly and decidedly expressed for the first time in the Book of Daniel (xii. 2), was during our period already firmly established (comp. *e.g.* 2 Macc. vii. 9, 14, 23, 36, xii. 43, 44; Enoch li. 1; *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq.; Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14; Apoc. Baruch xxx. 1–5, l. 1, li. 6; 4 Ezra vii. 32; *Testam. XII. Patriarch. Judae,* xxv.; *Benjamin* x.; *Shemoneh Esreh,* 2 Berachah; Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 1; *Aboth* iv. 22; comp. also *Berachoth* v. 2; *Sota* ix. 15, *fin.*). At least this applies with respect to all circles influenced by Pharisaism, and these formed by far the majority. Only the Sadducees denied the resurrection,[77] while the Alexandrian theology placed in its stead the immortality of the soul.[78] A

[74] The order is, according to 4 Ezra vii. 31-34: (1) The renovation of the world; (2) The general resurrection; (3) The last judgment. So also Gfrörer, ii. 272, 275, 285.

[75] Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 176–181, 203–206. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 275–285, 308 sqq. Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, iii. 307–310, 328–333, 349–351, 504–506. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, p. 338 sqq. Rothe, *Dogmatik*, ii. 2, pp. 68–71, 298–308. Oehler, *Theologie des A. T.* ii. 241 sqq. Herm. Schultz, *Alttestamentl. Theologie*, 2nd ed. pp. 713 sqq., 807 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 98 sqq. (art. "Belebung der Todten"). Stähelin, *Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, p. 199 sqq. Drummond, *The Jewish Messiah*, p. 360 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 371 sqq. Gröbler, *Die Ansichten über Unsterblichkeit und Auferstehung in der jüdischen Literatur der beiden letzten Jahrh. v. Chr.* (*Stud. und Krit.* 1879, pp. 651–700).

[76] This expression, *e.g. Berachoth* v. 2; *Sota* ix. 15, *fin.*; *Sanhedrin* x. 1.

[77] Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 4. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14.

[78] Wisd. iii. 1 sqq., iv. 7, v. 16. With respect to Philo, comp. Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, i. 403 sqq. According to Josephus

separation between the just and unjust in the intermediate state between death and the resurrection was as a rule accepted, a preliminary state of happiness or torment being allotted to departed souls (see especially Enoch xxii. and in 4 Ezra the section rejected in the usual Latin text, c. vi. 49–76, according to the computation of the Ethiopic translation, ed. Fritzsche, pp. 607–611).[79] The same expectation lies at the root of the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi. 22). In the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra, receptacles (*promptuaria*), into which the souls of the righteous are received after death, are frequently spoken of (Apoc. Baruch xxx. 2; 4 Ezra iv. 35, 41, vii. 32; in the rejected section, c. vi. 54, 68, 74, 76, in Bensly, vv. 80, 95, 101). In many passages of the New Testament the hope comes forward, that immediately after death the removal to the state of supreme and heavenly happiness will take place (Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. v. 8; Phil. i. 23; Acts vii. 59; Rev. vi. 9 sqq., vii. 9 sqq.), and this is not without analogy in the Jewish view, since here also the same is expected, at least for eminent men of God (not only for Enoch and Elijah, but *e.g.* also for Ezra and such as him, 4 Ezra xiv. 9: tu enim recipieris ab hominibus et converteris residuum cum filio meo et cum similibus tuis usquequo finiantur tempora).[79a] Established and generally accepted views on this point were not however formed.[80] The Apocalypse of Baruch gives detailed disclosures on the *resurrection body* (l. 1–li. 6. Comp. also 4 Ezra vi. 71 in the rejected section; in Bensly, ver. 97). One main difference in the doctrine of the resurrection consists in the expectation

the Essenes also did not teach a resurrection, but the immortality of the soul, see *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 11. Comp. also the *Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 24.

[79] In Bensly, *The Missing Fragment of the Latin Translation of the Fourth Book of Ezra* (1875), pp. 63–71, vv. 75–101.

[79a] Comp. also Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Luke xxiii. p. 322 sqq.

[80] Comp. also on the intermediate state Weber, *System*, p. 322 sqq.

of a resurrection of *the righteous only*, for the purpose of participating in the Messianic kingdom, or of a general resurrection (of the righteous and the ungodly) to judgment; and that at one time before the commencement of Messiah's reign, at another after its conclusion. The oldest form is certainly that first named (comp. note 65). It is found *e.g.* in *Psalt. Salom.* iii. 16, xiv. 2 sqq., but is also mentioned by Josephus as an average Pharisaic opinion (*Antt.* xviii. 1. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14). The expectation of a *general resurrection* to judgment, is the extension of this older resurrection hope. So Daniel, Enoch, Apoc. Baruch, 4 Ezra, Testam. XII. Patriarch., and the Mishna in the above-cited places.[81] Here again the distinction arises, as to whether the resurrection and judgment are expected before the commencement, or after the close of the Messianic period. The former view represented Dan. xii. 2, and Enoch li., is certainly the more ancient, for originally the object of the judgment was to inaugurate the Messianic period. Not till the Messianic blessedness ceased to be regarded as ultimate and supreme, was the judgment also, as the decision on man's final destiny, transferred to the close of the Messianic age. So especially Apoc. Baruch and 4 Ezra. In the *New Testament Apocalypse* the expectation of a resurrection of the just before the appearance of the Messianic kingdom is combined with that of a general resurrection after its close. The awakening itself takes place by the sounding of the *trump of God* (1 Cor. xv. 52; 1 Thess. iv. 16. Comp. Matt. xxiv. 31; 4 Ezra vi. 23).[82]

11. *The Last Judgment. Eternal Salvation and Condem-*

[81] In the Mishna, comp. especially *Aboth* iv. 22: "They who are born are destined to die; the dead to be awakened; the awakened to stand before the judgment-seat, that one may learn, teach, and be convinced that He is the Almighty," etc. In *Sanhedrin* x. 3 also the resurrection is assumed to be general, since it is said only exceptionally of certain prominent sinners, who have already in their lifetime received their judgment, that they will not rise to judgment.

[82] See also Weber, *System*, p. 352 sq. Stähelin, *Jahrbb. f. deutsche Theol.* 1874, pp. 198, 220, and the commentaries on 1 Cor. xv. 52 and 1 Thess. iv. 16.

*nation.*[83] A last judgment at the close of the Messianic period can only be spoken of, when limited duration is ascribed to the Messianic kingdom. Hence among the older authorities it is only the Apocalypse of Baruch and the fourth Book of Ezra which need here be considered. In the rest the judgment coincides with the destruction of the hostile powers, which takes place before the commencement of Messiah's reign (see above, No. 5). In the Apocalypse of Baruch, the judgment is but briefly alluded to (l. 4). The fourth Book of Ezra (vii. 33–35 and the rejected section, c. vi. 17, in Bensly, pp. 55–58) gives more detail. We here learn that it is God Himself who sits in judgment. Nor can there be any doubt from these two books, that on the day of judgment sentence will be passed not only on the people of Israel, but on the whole race of mankind (Baruch li. 4, 5; Ezra vi. 2, in Bensly, p. 55 sq.). It holds good as a general principle, that all Israelites are to share in the world to come (*Sanhedrin* x. 1: כָּל יִשְׂרָאֵל יֵשׁ לָהֶם חֵלֶק לָעוֹלָם הַבָּא). It is self-evident however, that all the sinners of Israel (who are carefully catalogued in the Mishna, *Sanhedrin* x. 1–4) are excluded. Since sentence is to be passed upon each individual exactly in proportion to his works, the deeds of men are, during their lifetime, written in *heavenly books* (Enoch xlviii. 7, 8, liv. 7, also lxxxix.–xc. *Book of Jubilees* in Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 38, and elsewhere. *Test. XII. Patr. Aser* 7. Mishna, *Aboth* ii. 1. Luke x. 20; Phil. iv. 3; Rev. iii. 5, xiii. 8, xx. 15. Hermas, *Vis.* i. 3. 2),[84] and sentence is passed according to the contents of these books. The ungodly are cast into the fire

[83] Comp. Bertholdt, *Christologia Judaeorum*, pp. 206–211, 221–226. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 285 sqq., 311 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 371 sqq.

[84] Comp. on these heavenly books, especially Harnack's note on Hermas, *Vis.* i. 3. 2; also Fabricius, *Cod. pseudepigr.* i. 551–562. Dillmann, *Das Buch Enoch*, p. 245. Ewald's *Jahrb.* iii. 83. Langen, *Das Judenthum in Palästina*, pp. 385, 499.

of Gehenna (Baruch xliv. 15, li. 1, 2, 4, 6; Ezra vi. 1–3, 59, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 64).[85] This condemnation is as a rule regarded as everlasting.[86] But the view is also met with of a temporal duration to the punishments of hell, giving them only the signification of a purgatory.[87] The righteous and godly are received into Paradise, and dwell in the high places of that world, and see the glory of God and of His holy angels. Their countenance will shine like the sun, and they will live for ever (Dan. xii. 3; Baruch li. 3, 7–14; Ezra vi. 1–3, 68–72, in Bensly, pp. 55 sq., 69 sq. Comp. also *Assumptio Mosis* x. 9, 10).[88]

[85] The Hebrew גֵּיהִנּוֹם, *Kiddushin* iv. 14; *Edujoth* ii. 10; *Aboth* i. 5, v. 19, 20. Frequently in the Targums and Talmud. In the New Testament γέεννα, Matt. v. 22, 29 sq., x. 28, xviii. 9, xxiii. 15, 33; Mark ix. 43, 45, 47; Luke xii. 5; Jas. iii. 6. Comp. also Enoch, ch. xxvii. and cviii. 4 sqq. Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* ii. 322–369. Lightfoot, *Horae* on Matt. v. 22. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* on Matt. v. 22. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.*, col. 395 sq. Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* i. 135 sq. Id. *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 323. Tholuck and Achelis in their expositions of the Sermon on the Mount on Matt. v. 22. The Lexicons of the New Testament, *s.v.* γέεννα. Dillmann, *Das Buch Enoch*, p. 131 sq. Weber, *System*, p. 326 sqq. Elsewhere *Hades and its darkness* are designated as the future lot of the wicked, *e.g. Psalt. Salom.* xiv. 6, xv. 11, xvi. 2.

[86] Isa. lxvi. 24; Dan. xii. 2; Matt. iii. 12, xxv. 46; Luke iii. 17. *Test. XII. Patr. Sebulon* 10. *Aser* 7. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 14: ἀϊδίῳ τιμωρίᾳ; *Antt.* xviii. 1. 3: εἱργμὸν ἀΐδιον (both passages are given in their connection, vol. i. pp. 381 and 383). Comp. Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 289.

[87] *Edujoth* ii. 10: "R. Akiba said, The execution of judgment upon Gog and Magog lasts twelve months, and the time of the condemnation of the ungodly lasts twelve months." In this however regard is had only to sinners who are *Israelites*.

[88] In Rabbinic Hebrew Paradise is generally called גַּן עֵדֶן (so *e.g. Aboth* v. 20), or also פַּרְדֵּס, but the latter not so often (in the Mishna this word is used only of a park in the natural sense, *Sanhedrin* x. 6; *Chullin* xii. 1; *Arachin* iii. 2). In the *Test. XII. Patr.* both occur (Ἐδέμ *Test. Dan.* 5, παράδεισος *Test. Levi* 18). In the New Testament παράδεισος, Luke xxiii. 43; 2 Cor. xii. 4; Rev. ii. 7. Much material in Eisenmenger, *Entdecktes Judenth.* ii. 295–322. Wetzstein, *Nov. Test.* 818–820 (on Luke xxiii. 43). Comp. also Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* on Luke xxiii. 43; Schöttgen on 2 Cor. xii. 4 and Rev. ii. 7. The interpreters of these New Testament passages in

12. *Appendix. The suffering Messiah.*[89] So far we have had no occasion to speak of the sufferings, or of any atoning death of the Messiah. For the prediction in the fourth Book of Ezra, that the Messiah should die after reigning 400 years (4 Ezra vii. 28, 29), has evidently nothing in common with the idea of an atoning death. But the question, whether Judaism in the age of Christ expected a suffering Messiah, and indeed a Messiah suffering and dying as an atonement for the sins of men, must not be left undiscussed. According to what has been said, the question seems answered, as indeed it has been by many (especially after the most thorough investigation by De Wette), in the negative. Others, on the contrary, as *e.g.* Wünsche, think it may be as decidedly answered in the affirmative. Certainly the sufferings of the Messiah are repeatedly spoken of in the Talmud. From the word וְהֵרִיחוֹ, Isa. xi. 3, it is inferred that God loaded the Messiah with commands and sorrows like mill-stones (במוצות ויסורין ברחים).[90] In another passage Messiah is described as sitting at the gates of Rome and binding and unbinding His wounds.[91] More important is it, that in Justin's *Dialogus cum Tryphone* it is repeatedly admitted, nay asserted as self-

general. Joh. Schulthess, *Das Paradies, das irdische und überirdische, historische, mythische und mystische* (Zürich 1816), p. 345 sqq. Arnold, art. "Paradies," in Ersch and Gruber's *Encykl.*, sec. iii. vol. xi. (1838), p. 304 sqq., especially 310 sqq. Thilo, *Cod. Apocr. Nov. Test.* p. 748 sqq. Klöpper, *Commentar zum zweiten Korintherbrief*, p. 506 sqq. Weber, *System*, p. 330 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 892–897 (art. "Paradies").

[89] Comp. De Wette, *De morte Jesu Christi expiatoria* (*Opusc.* c. pp. 1–148). Gfrörer, *Das Jahrhundert des Heils*, ii. 265–272. Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 440 sq. (2nd ed. ix. 670 sq.). Wünsche, יְסוּרֵי הַמָּשִׁיחַ *oder Die Leiden des Messias*, Leipzig 1870. Delitzsch, *Schet welch' ein Mensch!* (Leipzig 1872), pp. 13, 30 sq. Castelli, *Il Messia*, pp. 216–224, 329 sqq., 335 sqq. Weber, *System*, pp. 343–347. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 765–767 (art. "Messiasleiden"). De Wette as above, pp. 6–9, gives a list of the older literature.

[90] *Sanhedrin* 93b, given in Wünsche, *Die Leiden des Messias*, p. 56 sq.

[91] *Sanhedrin* 98a, in Delitzsch, *Hebräerbrief*, p. 117. Wünsche, p. 57 sq.

evident by the representative of the Jewish standpoint, that the Messiah must suffer. "When we name to them (relates Justin, c. 68) the passages of Scripture, which clearly prove that the Messiah must suffer, and is to be worshipped, and is God, they admit unwillingly indeed, that the Messiah is there spoken of; but nevertheless they venture to maintain, that this (Jesus) is not the Messiah. On the contrary, they believe that He will first come and *suffer* and rule and be a God worthy of adoration." Still more decidedly does Trypho express himself in another passage, c. 89: *Παθητὸν μὲν τὸν Χριστὸν ὅτι αἱ γραφαὶ κηρύσσουσι, φανερόν ἐστιν· εἰ δὲ διὰ τοῦ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ κεκατηραμένου πάθους, βουλόμεθα μαθεῖν, εἰ ἔχεις καὶ περὶ τούτου ἀποδεῖξαι.* Here indeed only sufferings in general, and not atoning sufferings, are spoken of, and the idea of death by crucifixion is decidedly rejected. But passages are also found, in which, in conformity with Isa. liii. 4 sqq., a suffering for the sake of the human race is spoken of. Thus among other names that of *Chulja* (חוליא the sick, or according to another reading חִיּוְרָא, the leper) is at one time attributed to the Messiah, and this is justified by an appeal to Isa. liii. 4: "Surely He has borne our sicknesses and taken upon Himself our sorrows; but we esteemed Him one stricken, smitten of God and afflicted."[92] According to the book *Sifre*, R. Joses the Galilean says: "King Messiah has been humbled and made contemptible on account of the rebellious, as it is said, He was wounded for our transgressions, etc. (Isa. liii. 5). How much more will He make satisfaction therefore for all generations, as it is written, 'And the Lord laid on Him the iniquity of us all (Isa. liii. 6).'"[93] The latter passage already shows, that in the second century

[92] *Sanhedrin* 98b, in Gfrörer, ii. 266. Wünsche, p. 62 sq.

[93] S. Wünsche, p. 65 sq. Delitzsch, *Paulus' Brief an die Römer* (1870), p. 82 sq. *Stellen aus späteren Midraschim und anderen Werken jüdischer Theologen bei Wünsche*, pp. 66–108

after Christ Isa. liii. 4 sqq. was in many circles explained of the Messiah.[94] This is confirmed by the saying of Trypho, in Justin's *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. 90: *Παθεῖν μὲν γὰρ καὶ ὡς πρόβατον ἀχθήσεσθαι οἴδαμεν· εἰ δὲ καὶ σταυρωθῆναι κ.τ.λ.* Thus the Jewish opponent of Justin admitted that Isa. liii. 7 is to be referred to the Messiah. Consequently it cannot be disputed, that in the second century after Christ the idea of a suffering Messiah, and indeed of a Messiah suffering as an atonement for human sin, was, at least in certain circles, a familiar one. *In this respect a thought, which in itself was quite current in Rabbinic Judaism, was applied to the Messiah*, viz. the thought that the perfectly righteous man not only fulfils all the commandments, but also atones by sufferings for sins that may have been committed, and *that the overplus suffering of the righteous man is of service to others.*[95] But however much the idea of a suffering Messiah is from these premises conceivable on the soil of Judaism, just as little did it become the prevailing view of Judaism. The, so to speak official, Targum Jonathan allows indeed the reference of Isa. liii. to the Messiah to remain on the whole, but denies the application to him of just those verses, which treat of the sufferings of the servant of God.[96] In not one of the numerous works discussed by us have we found even the slightest allusion to an atoning suffering of Messiah.

[94] R. Joses the Galilean was a contemporary of R. Akiba, and therefore lived in the first half of the second century after Christ (see vol. i. p. 378). R. Tarphon, who is probably identical with Justin's Trypho, was also a contemporary of both (see vol. i. p. 377). If then Trypho is ready to make those concessions, he thereby only represented views held in the circles of his Palestinian colleagues.

[95] See Weber, *System*, pp. 313–316.

[96] For particulars, see Oehler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* ix. 441 (2nd ed. ix. 670 sq.). Weber, *System*, p. 344 sq. On the history of the interpretation of Isa. liii. by the Jews, comp. also Origenes, c. *Celsum*, i. 55; and especially Driver and Neubauer, *The fifty-third chapter of Isaiah according to the Jewish Interpreters*, 2 vols. (1) *Texts*; (2) *Translations*. Oxford and London 1876–77 (*Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 567 sq.).

That the Jews were far from entertaining such an idea, is abundantly proved by the conduct of both the disciples and opponents of Jesus (Matt. xvi. 22; Luke xviii. 34, xxiv. 21; John xii. 34). Accordingly it may well be said, that it was on the whole one quite foreign to Judaism in general.

## § 30. THE ESSENES.

### The Literature.


Triglandius, *Trium scriptorum illustrium de tribus Judaeorum sectis syntagma*, 2 vols., Delphis 1703.

Joh. Gottlob Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus antiquitatum sacri codicis* (1748), pp. 215–240.

Ugolini, *Trihaeresium*, etc., in his *Thesaurus antiquitatum sacrarum*, vol. xxii.

Bellermann, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten aus dem Alterthume über Essäer und Therapeuten*, Berlin 1821.

Credner, *Ueber Essäer und Ebioniten und einen theilweisen Zusammenhang derselben*, in Winer's *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* vol. i. No. 2 (1827), pp. 211–264, and No. 3 (1829), pp. 277–328.

Gfrörer, *Philo und die alexandrinische Theosophie*, vol. ii. (1831) pp. 299–356.

Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, vol. i. (1834) pp. 439–497. The same, art. "Essäer," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyklop.* § 1, vol. xxxviii. (1843) pp. 173–192.

Frankel, *Die Essäer. A Sketch* (*Zeitschr. für die religiösen Interessen des Judenthums*, 1846, pp. 441–461).

Frankel, *Die Essäer nach thalmudischen Quellen* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 30–40, 61–73).

Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 270–322.

Uhlhorn, art. "Essener," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* vol. iv. (1855) pp. 174–177 (2nd ed. iv. 341–344).

Zeller, *Die Philosophie der Griechen*, Pt. 3, Div. ii. (1st ed. 1852), 2nd ed. 1868, pp. 234–292 (3rd ed. 1881, pp. 277–338). The same, *Ueber den Zusammenhang des Essäismus mit dem Griechenthum* (*Theol. Jahrbb* 1856, pp. 401–433).

Ritschl, *Ueber die Essener* (*Theol. Jahrbb.* 1855, pp. 315–356). The same, *Die Entstehung der altkathol. Kirche* (2nd ed. 1857), pp. 179–203.

Mangold, *Die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe* (1856), pp. 32–60.

Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokalyptik* (1857), pp. 243–286. The same, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* vol. i. 1858, p. 116 sqq.; iii. 1860, p. 358 sqq.; x. 1867, p. 97 sqq.; xi. 1868, p. 343 sqq.; xiv. 1871, p. 50 sqq.; xxv. 1882, p. 257 sqq.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, vol. iii. pp. 368 sqq., 388 sqq., 509 sqq.

Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vol i. pp. 207–214.

Grätz, *Geschichte der Juden* (3rd ed.), vol. iii. pp. 99 sqq., 657–663 (note 10).

Ewald, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. p. 483 sqq.

Harnischmacher, *De Essenorum apud Judaeos societate*, Bonn 1866 (*Gymnasialprogramm*).

Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, vol. i. pp. 282–306.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. ii pp. 74–89.

Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 166–175, 460–462.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, vol. i. 2nd ed. pp. 132–146.

Tidemann, *Het Essenisme*, Leiden 1868. The same, *Esseners en Therapeuten* (*Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1871, pp. 177–188). The same, *De apocalypse van Henoch en het Essenisme* (*Theol. Tijdschrift*, 1875, pp. 261–296).

Westcott, art. "Essenes," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.* Abbot gives additional literature in the American edition.

Ginsburg, art. "Essenes," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.* The same, *The Essenes, their history and doctrines*, London 1864.

Benamozegh, *Storia degli Esseni*, Firenze 1865.

Lauer, *Die Essäer und ihr Verhältniss zur Synagoge und Kirche.* Wien, Braumüller 1869 (a separate reprint from the Austrian *Quarterly Paper for Catholic Theology*, 7th year, no. 4).

Lipsius, art. "Essäer," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* vol. ii. pp. 181–192.

Clemens, *Die Quellen für die Geschichte der Essener* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1869, pp. 328–352).

Geiger, *Jüdische Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, vol. ix. 1871, pp. 30–56.

Clemens, *Die essenischen Gemeinden* (*Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1871, pp. 418–431).

Sieffert, *Christus und die Essäer* (*Beweis des Glaubens*, 1873, pp. 481–508).

Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 172–178 (art. "Essäer").

Delaunay, *Moines et sibylles dans l'antiquité judéo-grecque*, Paris 1874.

Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed. London 1876), pp. 82–98, 349–419.

Pick, *Die englische Literatur über die Essäer* (*Zeitschr. für die lutherische Theologie*, 1878, pp. 397–399).

Demmler, *Christus und der Essenismus* (*Theologische Studien aus Würtemberg*, 1st annual course, 1880, pp. 29 sqq., 122 sqq.).
Bestmann, *Geschichte der christlichen Sitte*, vol. i. (1880) p. 308 sqq.
Lucius, *Der Essenismus in seinem Verhältniss zum Judenthum*, Strassburg 1881.
Reuss, *Gesch. der heiligen Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 547.
Klöpper, *Der Brief an die Colosser* (1882), pp. 76–95.
Kuenen, *Volksreligion und Weltreligion* (German ed. 1883), pp. 197–206.
Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums* (1884), pp. 87–149.

Apart from the great high road of Jewish life, there lived in Palestine in the time of Christ a religious community which, though it grew up on Jewish soil, differed essentially in many points from traditional Judaism, and which, though it exercised no powerful influence upon the development of the people, deserves our attention as a peculiar problem in the history of religion. This community, the Essenes or Essaeans, is generally, after the precedent of Josephus, placed beside the Pharisees and Sadducees as the third Jewish sect. But it scarcely needs the remark, that we have here to deal with a phenomenon of an entirely different kind. While the Pharisees and Sadducees were large political and religious *parties*, the Essenes might far rather be compared to a *monastic order*. There is indeed much that is enigmatical in them as to particulars. Even their name is obscure. Josephus generally calls them Ἐσσηνοί,[1] but also Ἐσσαῖοι.[2] In Pliny they are called Esseni, in Philo always Ἐσσαῖοι. When Philo asserts that their name is identical with ὅσιοι, this is but etymological trifling.[3] In truth it is in any case of

[1] So on the whole fourteen times, *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9 (twice), xiii. 10. 6, xiii. 11. 2, xv. 10. 4, xv. 10. 5 (twice), xviii. 1. 2, xviii. 1. 5; *Vita*, c. ii.; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2, ii. 8. 11, ii. 8. 13, v. 4. 2 (comp. Harnischmacher, p. 5).

[2] So *Antt.* xv. 10. 4, xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5, ii. 7. 3, ii. 20. 4, iii. 2. 1.

[3] *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12 (Mang. ii. 457): διαλέκτου Ἑλληνικῆς παρώνυμοι ὁσιότητος. *Ibid.* § 13 (Mang. ii. 459): τὸν λεχθέντα ὅμιλον

Semitic origin, though but very little has with any certainty been ascertained concerning it.[4] The explanation formerly accepted by many, אָסְיָא, "Physicians," too little suits the peculiarity of the order, and has no support in the Greek *θεραπευταί*, the Essenes being never called "physicians," but only *θεραπευταὶ θεοῦ* (servants of God).[5] The derivation, advocated *e.g.* by Ewald, Hitzig, Lucius and others, from חָסִיד, pious, in the plural *stat. absol.* חֲסִידִין, *stat. emphat.* חֲסִידָיָא, which though not indeed occurring in either Hebrew or Chaldee, is only the more usual in Syrian, is that which is most suitable. The form *Ἐσσηνοί* corresponds with the former, *Ἐσσαῖοι* with the latter.[6] The *origin* of the Essenes is as obscure as their name. Josephus first mentions them in the time of Jonathan the Maccabee, about 150 B.C.,[7] and speaks expressly of one Judas an Essene in the time of Aristobulus I. (105–104 B.C.).[8] According to this, the origin of the order would have to be placed in the second century before Christ. But it is questionable whether they proceeded simply from Judaism, or whether foreign and especially Hellenistic elements had not also an influence in their organization. To

*τῶν Ἐσσαίων ἢ ὁσίων.* Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 1, ed. Gaisford): *καλοῦνται Ἐσσαῖοι παρὰ τὴν ὁσιότητα, μοὶ δοκῶ, τῆς προσηγορίας ἀξιωθέντες.* It seems to me improbable, that Philo was in these explanations thinking of the Semitic *chasê* (see Lucius, p. 89). On the contrary, he really derives the word from the Greek *ὁσιότης*.

[4] See the list of the different views in Keim, *Geschichte Jesu*, i. 285. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 278, 3rd ed. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon* (2nd ed.), pp. 349–354. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, p. 89 sq. Hilgenfeld, *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 98–101.

[5] Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12 (Mang. ii. 457).

[6] That an initial ח followed by a sibilant may be represented in Greek by *ἐσσ* or *ἀσσ* is seen *e.g.* from *ἐσσήνης* = חֶשְׁן (Joseph. *Antt.* iii. 7. 5, 8. 9), *ἀσσιδαῖοι* = חֲסִידִים, *Ἐσσεβών* = חֶשְׁבּוֹן. The formations by *ηνός* and *αῖος* are in Hellenistic Greek used *promiscue*; hence an appeal to the Semitic *status absolutus* and *emphaticus* is not necessary to explain them; still a certain amount of influence upon the structure of the Greek forms may probably be attributed to them.

[7] *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9.

[8] *Antt.* xiii. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5.

answer this question, we must first of all bring forward the accounts of our authorities, viz. Philo,[9] Josephus,[10] and Pliny,[11] for the purpose of making upon these foundations some approximation to the origin and nature of Essenism.

## I. THE FACTS.

1. *Organization of the community.* Philo and Josephus agree in estimating the number of the Essenes in their time at above 4000.[12] As far as is known, they lived only in Palestine, at least there are no certain traces of their occurrence out of Palestine.[13] According to Philo, they lived

[9] *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12, 13 (*Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 457–459) ; and the fragment in Eusebius, *Praeparatio evangelica*, viii. 11, accepted by Mangey. On the genuineness of the work, *Quod omnis probus liber*, see Lucius, pp. 13–23, and § 34, below.

[10] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2–13 ; *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9, xv. 10. 4–5, xviii. 1. 5.

[11] *Hist. Nat.* v. 17. The other authorities are either quite dependent on the three above named, or so scanty and unreliable as to be of scarcely any value. See generally on the authorities for the history of the Essenes, Bellermann, *Geschichtliche Nachrichten*, pp. 36–145. Clemens, *Zeitschr. für wissensch. Theol.* 1869, p. 328 sqq. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., 2nd ed. p. 83 sq. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp. 12–34. Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr.* 1882, pp. 266–289. *Ketzergeschichte*, pp. 87–149. In Rabbinic literature (Mishna, Tosefta, Talmud, Midrashim), the Essenes are apparently nowhere mentioned, at least not under this name. When Jewish scholars (Frankel, Herzfeld, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Geiger, Hamburger) have insisted on discovering them under other names, such identifications are some of them decidedly mistaken, some at least very questionable, as has been in most instances admitted by Geiger. See especially, *Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben*, 1871, pp. 49–56.

[12] Philo, ed. Mangey, ii. 457. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5. It seems to me scarcely doubtful, that Josephus has here made use of Philo. In the detailed description given by Josephus himself, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, the following points are missing : (1) The number 4000 ; (2) the repudiation of animal sacrifices ; (3) agriculture as the prevailing occupation ; (4) repudiation of slavery. All these points are mentioned by Philo, and inserted in the later account of Josephus, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5, but certainly because they are found in Philo's account.

[13] Whether the Christian ascetics of Rome (Rom. xiv.–xv.) and Colosse

chiefly in villages, avoiding towns because of the immorality of their inhabitants.[14] Yet he himself says, in another passage, that they also dwelt in many of the towns of Judaea,[15] while according to Josephus they were to be found in every town (of Palestine).[16] Hence we should be much mistaken if we were, according to Pliny's description, to seek them only in

(Col. ii.) were Christianized Essenes is very questionable. The occurrence of Essenes in *Syria* only would be evidenced, if the traditional reading ἡ Παλαιστίνη καὶ Συρία in the passage of Philo's *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 12, Mang. ii. 457 (see next note), is the correct one. It is however highly probable that the reading is ἡ Παλαιστίνη Συρία. For (1) Eusebius, who also quotes the passage, reads ἡ ἐν Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίᾳ. (2) The expression ἡ Παλαιστίνη Συρία is also elsewhere used by Philo (*De nobilitate*, § 6. Mang. ii. 443: Θάμαρ ἦν τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Παλαιστίνης Συρίας), and was moreover quite usual after Herodotus. See Herodot. i. 105: ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ Συρίῃ; ii. 106, the same; iii. 5, Σύρων τῶν Παλαιστίνων καλεομένων; iii. 91, Φοινίκη τε πᾶσα καὶ Συρίη ἡ Παλαιστίνη καλεομένη. Joseph. *Antt.* viii. 10. 3, τὴν Παλαιστίνην Συρίαν. Polemon in Euseb. *Praep. evang.* x. 10. 5 (ed. Gaisford), ἐν τῇ Παλαιστίνῃ καλουμένῃ Συρίᾳ. Dio Cass. xxxvii. 15, τὴν Συρίαν τὴν Παλαιστίνην. Still more material in Pape-Benseler, *Wörterb. der griech. Eigennamen*, s.v. Παλαιστίνη. Forbiger, *Geogr.* ii. 673 sq. Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 1070. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, ii. 183 sq. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (1881), p. 420 sqq. Παλαιστίνη is here always an adjective (the Palestinian Syria). From the passages quoted it is also evident, that, in the passage of Philo cited above, the reading is not, as many insist, Παλαιστίνη Συρίας, but Συρία. See *e.g.* Wieseler in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xxi. 291 (art. "Timotheusbriefe").

[14] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457: Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη [καὶ] Συρία καλοκἀγαθίας οὐκ ἄγονος, ἣν πολυανθρωποτάτου ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων οὐκ ὀλίγη μοῖρα νέμεται. Λέγονταί τινες παρ' αὐτοῖς ὄνομα Ἐσσαῖοι κ.τ.λ. . . . Οὗτοι τὸ μὲν πρῶτον κωμηδὸν οἰκοῦσι, τὰς πόλεις ἐκτρεπόμενοι, διὰ τὰς τῶν πολιτευομένων χειροήθεις ἀνομίας, εἰδότες ἐκ τῶν συνόντων ὡς ἀπ' ἀέρος φθοροποιοῦ νόσον ἐγγινομένην προσβολὴν ψυχαῖς ἀνίατον.

[15] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11, 1st ed. Gaisford): Οἰκοῦσι δὲ πολλὰς μὲν πόλεις τῆς Ἰουδαίας, πολλὰς δὲ κώμας, καὶ μεγάλους καὶ πολυανθρώπους ὁμίλους.

[16] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4: Μία δὲ οὐκ ἔστιν αὐτῶν πόλις, ἀλλ' ἐν ἑκάστῃ κατοικοῦσι πολλοί. There were certainly Essenes in Jerusalem also, where they frequently make an appearance in history (*Antt.* xiii. 11. 2, xv. 10. 5, xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 4), and where a gate was named after them (*Bell. Jud.* v. 4. 2, ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐσσηνῶν πύλην), probably because the house of their order was near it.

the desert of Engedi on the Dead Sea.[17] On the contrary, the settlement there can only have been distinguished above others on account of its numbers. For the sake of living as a community, they had special houses of the order in which they dwelt together.[18] Their whole community was most strictly organized as a single body. At the head were presidents (*ἐπιμεληταί*), whom the members were bound unconditionally to obey.[19] Whoever desired to enter the order received three badges (the naming of which will hereafter be seen): a pickaxe (*ἀξινάριον*), an apron (*περίζωμα*), and a white garment (*λευκὴν ἐσθῆτα*). He was not, however, immediately received into the order, but had first to undergo a probation of one year, after which he was admitted to the lustrations. Then followed a further probation of two years. And not till this was ended was he allowed to participate in the common meals, and to become a full member after first taking a fearful oath. In this oath he had to bind himself both to absolute openness

[17] *Hist. Nat.* v. 17: Ab occidente litora Esseni fugiunt usque qua nocent, gens sola, et in toto orbe praeter ceteras mira, sine ulla femina, omni venere abdicata, sine pecunia, socia palmarum. In diem ex aequo convenarum turba renascitur large frequentantibus quos vita fessos ad mores eorum fortunae fluctibus agit. Ita per seculorum milia (incredibile dictu) gens aeterna est. In qua nemo nascitur. Tam fecunda illis aliorum vitae poenitentia est. Infra hos Engada oppidum fuit, etc. Dio Chrysostomus (1st century after Christ) also, according to the testimony of his biographer Synesius, mentioned the Essenes as a community at the Dead Sea. Synesii *Opp.* ed. Petav. p. 39: *ὅτι καὶ τοὺς Ἐσσηνοὺς ἐπαινεῖ που, πόλιν ὅλην εὐδαίμονα τὴν παρὰ τὸ νεκρὸν ὕδωρ ἐν τῇ μεσογείᾳ τῆς Παλαιστίνης κειμένην παρ' αὐτά που τὰ Σόδομα.* Probably Pliny and Dio Chrysostomus draw from a common source. Comp. Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp. 30–33.

[18] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 5, ed. Gaisford): *Οἰκοῦσι δ' ἐν ταὐτῷ, κατὰ θιάσους ἑταιρίας καὶ συσσίτια ποιούμενοι, καὶ πάνθ' ὑπὲρ τοῦ κοινωφελοῦς πραγματευόμενοι διατελοῦσιν.* Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, says at least that at meals they *εἰς ἴδιον οἴκημα συνίασιν, ἔνθα μηδενὶ τῶν ἑτεροδόξων ἐπιτέτραπται παρελθεῖν.* Comp. also Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 458: *Οὐδενός οἰκία τίς ἐστιν ἰδία, ἣν οὐχὶ πάντων εἶναι συμβέβηκε. Πρὸς γὰρ τὸ κατὰ θιάσους συνοικεῖν, ἀναπέπταται καὶ τοῖς ἑτέρωθεν ἀφικνουμένοις τῶν ὁμοζήλων.*

[19] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6.

towards the brethren, and to secrecy concerning the doctrines of the order to non-members.[20] Only adults were admitted as members.[21] But children were also received for the purpose of training in the principles of Essenism.[22] When Josephus says that the Essenes were divided into four classes according to their time of entrance,[23] such children are to be understood by the first class, the two stages of the novitiate by the second and third, and the members proper by the fourth. Transgressions of members of the order were decided upon by a tribunal of at least one hundred of their fellow-members.[24] Those who had grievously transgressed were expelled from the community.[25]

The strongest tie by which the members were united was absolute *community of goods*. "The community among them is wonderful, one does not find that one possesses more than another. For it is the law, that those who enter deliver up their property to the order, so that there is nowhere to be seen, either the humiliation of poverty or the superfluity of wealth, but on the contrary *one* property for all as brethren, formed by the collection of the possessions of individuals."[26] "They neither buy nor sell among each other; but while one gives to another what he wants, he receives in return what is useful to himself, and without anything in return they receive freely whatever they want."[27] "The managers (ἐπιμεληταί) of the common property are chosen; and each is selected by all for ministration of the possessions of the community."[28] "They choose fitting persons as receivers of revenues (ἀποδέκτας τῶν

[20] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7.

[21] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11, 3rd ed. Gaisford).

[22] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2.

[23] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 10: Διήρηνται δὲ κατὰ χρόνον τῆς ἀσκήσεως εἰς μοίρας τέτταρας.

[24] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9.

[25] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 8.

[26] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3.

[27] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4.

[28] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3: Χειροτονηταὶ δὲ οἱ τῶν κοινῶν ἐπιμεληταί, καὶ αἱρετοὶ τοὺς ἀπάντων εἰς τὰς χρείας ἕκαστοι.

προσόδων) and of the produce of the earth, and priests for the preparation of bread and food."[29] So Josephus. And in accordance with this Philo declares "none desires to have any kind of property of his own, neither a house, nor a slave, nor an estate, nor flocks, nor anything at all that constitutes wealth. But by putting everything together without distinction, they enjoy the common use of all."[30] "The wages which they earn by different kinds of work, they give to a chosen manager (ταμίας). He receives them and buys what is wanted, and dispenses abundant provision and whatever else human life requires."[31] "Not only have they food, but also clothing in common. Thick cloaks are ready for winter, and light overalls for summer, so that each may use them at his pleasure. For what one has is regarded as the property of all; and what all have as that of each individual."[32] "There is but *one* purse for all, and common expenses, common clothes and common food in common meals. For community of dwelling, of life and of meals is nowhere so firmly established and so developed as with them. And this is intelligible. For what they receive daily as wages for their labour, they do not keep for themselves, but put it together, and thus make the profits of their work common for those who desire to make use of it. And the sick are without anxiety on account of their inability to earn, because the common purse is in readiness for the care of them, and they may with all certainty meet their expenses from abundant stores."[33]

[29] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: Ἀποδέκτας δὲ τῶν προσόδων χειροτονοῦσι καὶ ὁπόσα ἡ γῆ φέροι ἄνδρας ἀγαθούς, ἱερεῖς τε διὰ ποίησιν σίτου τε καὶ βρωμάτων.

[30] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 632 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 4).

[31] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 10): Ἐκ δὴ τῶν οὕτως διαφερόντων ἕκαστοι τὸν μισθὸν λαβόντες ἐνὶ διδόασι τῷ χειροτονηθέντι ταμίᾳ. Λαβὼν δ' ἐκεῖνος αὐτίκα τἀπιτήδεια ὠνεῖται, καὶ παρέχει τροφὰς ἀφθόνους, καὶ τἄλλα ὧν ὁ ἀνθρώπινος βίος χρειώδης.

[32] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 623 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11, 12).

[33] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 458 sq.: Εἶτ' ἐστὶ ταμεῖον ἓν πάντων καὶ δαπάναι, καὶ κοιναὶ μὲν ἐσθῆτες, κοιναὶ δὲ τροφαὶ συσσίτια πεποιημένων. Τὸ γὰρ

As already intimated in the above quoted passages, it is self-evident, that in this strictly communistic life all the needy of the order would be cared for. If any one was sick, he was tended at the common expense. The old enjoyed a happy old age under the care of the younger, just as if they had had many and excellent children about them.[34] Every one had the right to help the needy from the common purse, according to his discretion. Only when relatives were in question, had he to obtain the consent of the managers (*ἐπίτροποι*).[35] Travelling members of the order found hospitality everywhere. Nay a special officer (*κηδεμών*) was appointed in every town, to care for the wants of travelling brothers.[36]

The *daily labour* of the Essenes was under strict regulation. It began with prayer, after which the members were dismissed to their work by the presidents. They reassembled for purifying ablutions, which were followed by the common meal. After this they again went to work, to assemble again for their evening meal.[37] The chief employment of members of the order was agriculture.[38] They likewise carried on, however, crafts of every kind. On the other hand, trading was forbidden as leading to covetousness, and also the making

*ὁμωρόφιον ἢ ὁμοδίαιτον ἢ ὁμοτράπεζον οὐκ ἄν τις εὕροι παρ' ἑτέροις μᾶλλον ἔργῳ βεβαιούμενον. Καὶ μήποτ' εἰκότως; Ὅσα γὰρ ἂν μεθ' ἡμέραν ἐργασάμενοι λάβωσιν ἐπὶ μισθῷ, ταῦτ' οὐκ ἴδια φυλάττουσιν, ἀλλ' εἰς μέσον προτιθέντες κοινὴν τοῖς ἐθέλουσι χρῆσθαι τὴν ἀπ' αὐτῶν παρασκευάζουσιν ὠφέλειαν. Οἵτε νοσηλεύοντες οὐχ ὅτι πορίζειν ἀδυνατοῦσιν ἀμελοῦνται, πρὸς τὰς νοσηλείας ἐκ τῶν κοινῶν ἔχοντες ἐν ἑτοίμῳ ὡς μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας ἐξ ἀφθονωτέρων ἀναλίσκειν.*

[34] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. *Praep. evang.* viii. 11. 13)

[35] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6. The managers (*ἐπιμεληται*, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3; *ἀποδέκται τῶν προσόδων*, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5; *ταλίαι*, Philo, ii. 633 = Euseb. viii. 11. 10; *ἐπίτροποι*, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6) seem to have been at the same time the presidents of the order. For the latter also are called *ἐπιμεληταί* (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, 6).

[36] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4.

[37] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5.

[38] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: *τὸ πᾶν πονεῖν ἐπὶ γεωργίᾳ τετραμμένοι.*

of weapons or of any kind of utensils that might injure men.[39]

2. *Ethics. Manners and Customs.* The Essenes are described by both Philo and Josephus as very connoisseurs in morality. Josephus calls them *Βέλτιστοι ἄνδρες τὸν τρόπον.*[40] And Philo competes with him in sounding their praise.[41] Their life was *abstemious, simple and unpretending.* "They condemn sensual desires as sinful, and esteem moderation and freedom from passion as of the nature of virtue."[42] They only take food and drink till they have had enough;[43] abstaining from passionate excitement, they are "just dispensers of wrath."[44] At their meals they are "contented with the same dish day by day, loving sufficiency and rejecting great expense as harmful to mind and body."[45] They do not cast away clothes and shoes until they are utterly useless.[46] They do not collect treasures of gold and silver, nor earn them from the desire to acquire large estates, but only what is needed for the wants of life.[47]

Beside these general features of simplicity and moderation however, we meet in their moral principles, in their usages and customs, a series of *special points*, which we shall here simply enumerate, reserving the explanation of them for a later occasion. (1) There is not a *slave* among them, but *all* are free, mutually working for each other.[48] (2) "All that

[39] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457, 633 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 8-9).

[40] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5.

[41] Comp. especially what Philo says, ii. 458, concerning their instruction, with the matter of the oath, which according to Josephus each had to take on entering the community.

[42] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2: *τὰς μὲν ἡδονὰς ὡς κακίαν ἀποστρέφονται, τὴν δὲ ἐγκράτειαν καὶ τὸ μὴ τοῖς πάθεσιν ὑποπίπτειν ἀρετὴν ὑπολαμβάνουσι.*

[43] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5, *fin.* The cause of rest and quietness at meals is *ὁ διηνεκὴς νῆψις καὶ τὸ μετρεῖσθαι παρ' αὐτοῖς τροφὴν καὶ ποτὸν μέχοι κόρου.*

[44] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6: *ὀργῆς ταμίαι δίκαιοι, θυμοῦ καθεκτικοί.*

[45] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 633 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 11).

[46] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 4. [47] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457.

[48] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 457: *Δοῦλός τε παρ' αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ εἷς ἐστίν, ἀλλ'*

they say is more certain than an oath. They *forbid swearing*, because it is worse than perjury. For that which does not deserve belief without an appeal to God, is already condemned."[49] (3) They *forbid anointing with oil.* And if one has been anointed against his will, he wipes it off. "For they regard a rough exterior as praiseworthy."[50] (4) Before every meal they *bathe in cold water.*[51] They do the same after performing the functions of nature.[52] Nay even mere contact with a member of the order of a lower class requires a purifying bath.[53] (5) They esteem it seemly to wear white raiment at all times,[54] on which account a white garment is delivered to each member on entrance.[55] (6) They behave with special modesty in performing natural functions. They dig with the pickaxe (*σκαλίς, ἀξινάριον*), which each member receives, a hole of a foot deep, cover themselves with a mantle, that they may not offend the brightness of God (*ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ*), relieve themselves into the hole, and throw in again the earth that had been dug out. They choose the most solitary place for the purpose, and bathe afterwards as the unclean are accustomed to do. On the Sabbath they entirely abstain from the act.[56] Their modesty is also shown in other ways. In bathing they bind an apron about their loins.[57] They also avoid spitting for-

*ἐλεύθεροι πάντες, ἀνθυπουργοῦντες ἀλλήλοις.* Comp. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: *οὔτε δούλων ἐπιτηδεύουσι κτῆσιν.*

[49] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8, 6: *πᾶν μὲν τὸ ῥηθὲν ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἰσχυρότερον ὅρκου, τὸ δὲ ὀμνύειν περιίστανται, χεῖρόν τι τῆς ἐπιορκίας ὑπολαμβάνοντες· ἤδη γὰρ κατεγνῶσθαί φασι τὸ ἀπιστούμενον δίχα θεοῦ.* Comp. *Antt.* xv. 10. 4 (Herod exempts the Essenes from oaths). Philo, ii. 458: they teach *τὸ ἀνώμοτον, τὸ ἀψευδές.*

[50] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3: *κηλῖδα δὲ ὑπολαμβάνουσι τὸ ἔλαιον, κἂν ἀλιφῇ τις ἄκων, σμήχεται τὸ σῶμα· τὸ γὰρ αὐχμεῖν ἐν καλῷ τίθενται.*

[51] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5: *ἀπολούονται τὸ σῶμα ψυχροῖς ὕδασι.*

[52] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9, *fin.* [53] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 10, *init.*

[54] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 3: *τὸ γὰρ αὐχμεῖν ἐν καλῷ τίθενται, λευχειμονεῖν τε διὰ παντός.*

[55] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7. [56] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9. [57] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5.

wards or to the right hand.[58] (7) They *entirely condemned marriage.*[59] Josephus indeed knew of a branch of Essenes who permitted marriage.[60] But these must at all events have formed a small minority. For Philo says expressly: *Ἐσσαίων οὐδεὶς ἄγεται γυναῖκα.* (8) They sent gifts of incense to the temple, but *offered no animal sacrifices,* because they esteemed their own sacrifices more valuable. They were on this account excluded from the temple at Jerusalem.[61] (9) Lastly, a chief peculiarity of the Essenes was their *common meals,* which bore the character of *sacrificial feasts.* The food was prepared by priests,[62] with the observance probably of certain rites of purification; for an Essene was not permitted to partake of any other food than this.[63] The meals are described as follows by Josephus: "After the bath of purification they betake themselves to a dwelling of their own, entrance into which is forbidden to all of another faith. And being clean they go into the refectory as into a sanctuary. And after they have quietly taken their seats, the baker lays down the bread in order, and the cook sets before each a vessel with a single kind of food. The priest prays before the meal, and none may eat before the prayer. After the meal he prays again. At the beginning and end they honour God as the giver of food. Then they put off their garments as sacred and go back to their work till evening. Returning, they feed again in the same manner."[64] (10) The wide-spread opinion,

[58] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9: *τὸ πτύσαι δὲ εἰς μέσους ἢ τὸ δεξιὸν μέρος φυλάσσονται.*

[59] Philo, ii. 633–634 (= Euseb. viii. 11. 14–17). Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 2; *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5. Plin. *Hist. Nat.* v. 17.

[60] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 13.

[61] Philo, ii. 457: *οὐ ζῶα καταθύοντες, ἀλλ' ἱεροπρεπεῖς τὰς ἑαυτῶν διανοίας κατασκευάζειν ἀξιοῦντες.* Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: *εἰς δὲ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀναθήματα στέλλοντες θυσίας οὐκ ἐπιτελοῦσι διαφορότητι ἁγνειῶν ἃς νομίζοιεν, καὶ δι' αὐτὸ εἰργόμενοι τοῦ κοινοῦ τεμενίσματος ἐφ' αὑτῶν τὰ θυσίας ἐπιτελοῦσι.*

[62] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5.

[63] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 8.

[64] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5. Undoubtedly we must behold in these meals the

that the Essenes abstained from the use of *meat* and *wine*, has no support from the older authorities, and has lately been rightly opposed by Lucius.[65] As indirect arguments are usually adduced (*a*) their rejection of animal sacrifices, the reason of which was, that the Essenes regarded the slaughter of animals in general as objectionable; and (*b*) the refusal of the kindred sects of the Therapeutae Pythagoreans and Ebionites to partake of meat and wine. It cannot however be proved, that their repudiation of animal sacrifices proceeded from the motives mentioned, and the degree of affinity between Essenism and the above-named tendencies respectively must first be ascertained from established facts. Jerome certainly ascribes to the Essenes an abstinence from flesh and wine. But his assertion can be proved to rest only upon gross carelessness in rendering the words of Josephus.[66]

sacrifices (*θυσίαι*) which the Essenes, according to Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 1. 5), regarded as of more value than those at Jerusalem. The *ἱεραὶ ἐσθῆτες* were certainly *linen* garments. For the Essenes always wore *white* raiment. Hence the distinctive quality of their sacred garments must have lain in their material.

[65] Lucius, *Die Therapeuten*, p. 38 f. The same, *Die Essenismus*, p. 56 f.

[66] *Hieronymus adv. Jovinian.* ii. 14 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, ii. 343): Josephus in secunda Judaicae captivitatis historia et in octavo decimo antiquitatum libro et contra Apionem duobus voluminibus tria describit dogmata Judaeorum: Pharisaeos, Sadducaeos, Essaenos. Quorum novissimos miris effert laudibus, quod et ab uxoribus *et vino et carnibus semper abstinuerint* et quotidianum jejunium verterint in naturam. The commencement of these words proves, that Jerome was not in them using Josephus at all, but Porphyry, who in his work, *de abstinentia*, iv. 11–13, restores the account of Josephus (comp. *de abstinentia*, iv. 11: *Ἰώσηπος . . . ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῆς Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἱστορίας . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ ὀκτωκαιδεκάτῳ τῆς ἀρχαιολογίας . . . καὶ ἐν τῷ δευτέρῳ τῷ πρὸς τοὺς Ἕλληνας*; the last statement is a mistake, the sects not being mentioned in the books *contra Apionem*). But neither Josephus nor Porphyrius tells us anything about the Essenes abstaining from flesh and wine. Porphyrius himself certainly requires throughout his work abstinence from the use of flesh. But he is accurate enough not to introduce any extraneous matter into the narrative of Josephus (hence the statement in Lucius, p. 56, is incorrect; comp. also Zeller, p. 287). It was Jerome who first undertook this completion. But as he supports his assertion solely on Josephus, it is entirely without value. For *the partaking*

3. *Theology and Philosophy.* The view of the world held by the Essenes was fundamentally the Jewish. When Josephus ascribes to them belief in an unalterable fate, by which human freedom was absolutely abolished,[67] this must undoubtedly be understood only in the sense of an absolute belief in Providence.[68] And when he says that the Essenes make everything, the Sadducees nothing dependent on fate, while the Pharisees occupy a middle position between the two, thus much may be true, that the Essenes were particularly decided in their adherence to that belief in Providence, which they held in common with the Pharisees. The Essenes are in this point only decided Pharisees, as they are also in *a high esteem for the Law and the Lawgiver.* "Next to God, the name of the Lawgiver is with them an object of the greatest reverence, and whoever blasphemes it is punished with death."[69] "Their pursuit of ethic is especially thorough, since they take for instructors the laws of their fathers, which no human soul could possibly have conceived without Divine inspiration."[70] In their worship, as well as in that of other

*of flesh and wine by the Essenes* at least two *probable reasons* may be adduced: (1) According to Philo, ii. 633 = Euseb. *Præp. evang.* viii. 11. 8, they also carried on *cattle-rearing.* (2) Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5 declares the peace and silence of their meals to result from the circumstance, that they partook of *meat and drink* (τροφὴν καὶ ποτόν) only till they had had enough, which has no meaning unless they drank wine.

[67] Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 5. 9. Comp. xviii. 1–5: Ἐσσηνοῖς δ' ἐπὶ μὲν θεῷ καταλιπεῖν φιλεῖ τὰ πάντα ὁ λόγος.

[68] Comp. what is remarked above, p. 16, on the Pharisees.

[69] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9: Σέβας δὲ μέγιστον παρ' αὐτοῖς μετὰ τὸν θεὸν τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ νομοθέτου· κἂν βλασφημήσῃ τις εἰς τοῦτον, κολάζεται θανάτῳ.

[70] Philo, ii. 458: Τὸ ἠθικὸν εὖ μάλα διαπονοῦσιν, ἀλείπτας χρώμενοι τοῖς πατρίοις νόμοις, οὓς ἀμήχανον ἀνθρωπίνην ἐπινοῆσαι ψυχὴν ἄνευ κατακωχῆς ἐνθέου. Comp. Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8–12: βίβλοις ἱεραῖς καὶ διαφόροις ἁγνείαις καὶ προφητῶν ἀποφθέγμασιν ἐμπαιδοτριβούμενοι. Whether, on the other hand, the Holy Scriptures are intended by the συγγράμμασι τῶν παλαιῶν, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6, is questionable, since according to *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7 the sect had also its special books.

Jews, the Holy Scriptures were read and explained; and Philo remarks, that they specially delighted in allegorical interpretation.[71] They were extraordinarily strict in the celebration of the Sabbath. They did not venture on that day to move a vessel from its place, nor even to perform the functions of nature.[72] In other respects too they showed themselves to be Jews. Though they were excluded from the temple they sent gifts of incense (*ἀναθήματα*) there.[73] And they seem to have kept to the priesthood of the house of Aaron.[74]

On this decidedly Jewish foundation, it is self-evident, that any real worship of the sun is out of the question. When therefore Josephus declares that "daily before the rising of the sun, they address to it old traditional prayers, supplicating it, as it were, to rise,"[75] this cannot be meant in the sense of an *adoratio*, but only in that of an *invocatio* (observe the *εἰς αὐτόν*). Certainly such an *invocatio* is of itself striking in Jewish monotheists, as being apparently founded on the idea (so alien to Jewish consciousness), that the sun is the representative of the Divine light? That they did proceed upon the latter conception must be assumed from the motive stated

[71] Philo, ii. 458. In explanation of the passage, comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 426; *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 293 sq.

[72] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9. [73] *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5.

[74] The question here is concerning the interpretation of the passage, *Antt.* xviii. 1. 5: *Ἀποδέκτας δὲ τῶν προσόδων χειροτονοῦσι καὶ ὁπόσα ἡ γῆ φέροι ἄνδρας ἀγαθούς, ἱερεῖς τε διὰ ποίησιν σίτου τε καὶ βρωμάτων.* This is generally translated: "They choose excellent men as receivers of revenues and of what the earth produces, and (they choose just such men) as priests for the sake of the preparation of bread and food." But it should rather be translated, "and (they choose) priests for the preparation of bread and food." In the former case the meaning would be, that they knew of no hereditary, but only an elective priesthood; in the latter it would be stated, that they took their bakers and cooks out of the number of the priests (of the house of Aaron).

[75] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 5: *Πρὶν γὰρ ἀνασχεῖν τὸν ἥλιον οὐδὲν φθέγγονται τῶν βεβήλων, πατρίους δέ τινας εἰς αὐτὸν εὐχάς, ὥσπερ ἱκετεύοντες ἀνατεῖλαι.*

by them for their caution in the performance of their needs, viz. that they might not offend the brightness of God.[76]

An intermingling of heterogeneous elements is here already found, and much that is peculiar and alien to traditional Judaism appears in their teaching in general. When indeed Josephus says, that whoever entered their order had to swear not to teach any of their ordinances (*δόγματα*) otherwise than he had himself received them,[77] it may, by reason of the extensiveness of the notion of *δόγμα*, be doubtful whether special *doctrines* are meant thereby. At any rate however the order was in possession of special books, the careful preservation of which was made the duty of the members.[78] And with respect to their doctrines certain peculiarities are at least known to us. They searched the writings of the ancients (it is not clear whether the books of the sect or the canonical Scriptures are meant) to discover what would profit the soul and the body, the sanatory powers of roots, and the properties of stones.[79] They must have highly estimated their angelology. The novice had to swear carefully to preserve the names of the angels.[80] By reason of their study of Scripture and their purifications they ensured a knowledge of the future, and Josephus asserts that they were seldom mistaken in their predictions,[81] and gives several examples of correct prophecies by Essenes, *e.g.* by one Judas in the time

[76] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 9: *ὡς μὴ τὰς αὐγὰς ὑβρίζοιεν τοῦ θεοῦ.* The contrary assumption is incidentally met with in the Testam. XII. Patriarch. Benjamin, c. 8: *ὁ ἥλιος οὐ μιαίνεται προσέχων ἐπὶ κόπρον καὶ βόρβορον, ἀλλὰ μᾶλλον ἀμφότερα ψύχει καὶ ἀπελαύνει τὴν δυσωδίαν.*

[77] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: *μηδενὶ μὲν μεταδοῦναι τῶν δογμάτων ἑτέρως ἢ ὡς αὐτὸς μετέλαβεν.*

[78] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: *συντηρήσειν ὁμοίως τά τε τῆς αἱρέσεως αὐτῶν βιβλία.*

[79] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 6: *Σπουδάζουσι δὲ ἐκτόπως περὶ τὰ τῶν παλαιῶν συγγράμματα, μάλιστα τὰ πρὸς ὠφέλειαν ψυχῆς καὶ σώματος ἐκλέγοντες. Ἐνθεν αὐτοῖς πρὸς θεραπείαν παθῶν ῥίζαι τε ἀλεξητήριοι καὶ λίθων ἰδιότητες ἀνερευνῶνται.*

[80] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 7: *συντηρήσειν . . . τὰ τῶν ἀγγέλων ὀνόματα.*

[81] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 8. 12.

of Aristobulus I.,[82] one Menahem in the time of Herod,[83] and one Simon in the time of Archelaus.[84] Concerning their doctrine *of the soul and of its immortality*, Josephus expresses himself most fully. If we may trust his account, they taught that bodies are perishable, but souls immortal, and that the latter dwelt originally in the subtlest aether, but being debased by sensual pleasures united themselves with bodies as with prisons; but when they are freed from the fetters of sense they will joyfully soar on high, as if delivered from long bondage. To the good (souls) is appointed a life beyond the ocean, where they are troubled by neither rain, nor snow, nor heat, but where a gentle Zephyr is ever blowing. But to the bad (souls) is appointed a dark cold region full of unceasing torment.[85]

### II. NATURE AND ORIGIN OF ESSENISM.

Full as are the descriptions of our authorities, especially Josephus, the question from what point of view these various phenomena are to be explained, and from what general views and motives they proceed, remains to this day undecided. Some (and they now form the majority) insist on explaining Essenism wholly from Judaism, regarding it either as virtually identical with Pharisaism, or at least deriving it (with all its divergences) from Chasidaeic or Pharisaic Judaism. So especially the Jewish scholars Frankel, Jost, Grätz, Derenbourg, Geiger, and among Christian scholars, Ewald, Hausrath,

[82] *Antt.* xiii. 11. 2; *Bell. Jud.* i. 3. 5.

[83] *Antt.* xv. 10. 5. [84] *Antt.* xvii. 13. 3; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 3.

[85] *Bell. Jud.* 8. 11: Καὶ γὰρ ἔρρωται παρ' αὐτοῖς ἥδε ἡ δόξα, φθαρτὰ μὲν εἶναι τὰ σώματα καὶ τὴν ὕλην οὐ μόνιμον αὐτοῖς, τὰς δὲ ψυχὰς ἀθανάτους ἀεὶ διαμένειν, καὶ συμπλέκεσθαι μέν, ἐκ τοῦ λεπτοτάτου φοιτώσας αἰθέρος, ὥσπερ εἱρκταῖς τοῖς σώμασιν ἴυγγι τινι φυσικῇ καταποθείσας, ἐπειδὰν δὲ τότε χαίρειν καὶ μετεώρους φέρεσθαι κ.τ.λ.

Tideman, Lauer, Clemens, Reuss, and Kuenen. Ritschl advocates this standpoint in a peculiar manner. He regards Essenism as only a consistent carrying out of the idea of the universal priesthood (Ex. xix. 6). He endeavours to explain all the single facts from one, viz. that the Essenes desired to be a nation of priests. Similarly Bestmann, only he does not see in Essenism the carrying out of the idea of the universal, but of the Aaronic priesthood. Lucius also esteems Essenism as a purely Jewish formation, and explains its origin from the exclusively "pious" having in the Maccabaean period renounced the Jerusalem temple-worship, because they regarded it as illegitimate. From this renunciation of the temple-worship, all the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained. In another manner again did Hilgenfeld formerly derive Essenism purely from Judaism. He thought (in his work on *Jewish Apocalypse*, 1857, p. 243 sqq.), that the Essenes must be regarded as merely a school of Jewish apocalyptics. The object of their asceticism (as in Dan. x. 2, 3; Enoch lxxxiii. 2, lxxxv. 3, 4; Ezra ix. 24–26, xii. 51) was, he says, solely that of making themselves worthy and capable of receiving revelations. "It was the higher illumination, the reception of revelations especially by dream-visions, which they sought in this way to attain" (p. 253). Hilgenfeld, after defending this view in his *Zeitschrift* for 1858, p. 116 sqq., hinted already in that for 1860 at the possibility of Persian influence. Subsequently, in that for 1867, p. 97 sqq., he sought decidedly to prove, that not only Parseeism, but also Buddhism had exercised essential influence upon the formation of Essenism, to which view he adhered for a longer time (1868, p. 343 sqq.; 1871, p. 50 sqq.).[86] In his more

[86] In a certain sense he had already a predecessor in Philo, who adduces as examples of asceticism first the Persian *Magi*, then the Indian *Gymnosophists*, and immediately after the Essenes (*Quod omnis probus liber*, § 11, 12, ed. Mang. ii. 456, 457: Ἐν Πέρσαις μὲν τὸ Μάγων, . . . Ἐν Ἰνδοῖς

recent publications he again insists upon the Jewish foundation and admits only Parsee influences (*Zeitschr.* 1882, p. 299; *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 141–149); he thinks the Essenes were originally Rechabites, who settled in a place called Essa, westward of the Dead Sea (*Zeitschr.* 1882, pp. 268 sqq., 286 sqq.; *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, pp. 100 sqq., 139 sqq.).[87] Lightfoot also (*St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon*, 2nd ed. pp. 355–396) adopts the opinion of a virtual Jewish foundation, with secondary Parsee influence. Lipsius too declares the origin of Essenism to be chiefly Jewish; he however concedes the co-operation of foreign influences, only not on the part of Greek philosophy or Parseeism, and still less of Buddhism, but on that of Syro-Palestinian heathenism. The development of Essenism "took place entirely on Palestinian soil" (*Bibellexikon*, ii. 189, 190). While all the above-named regard Essenism as exclusively or chiefly a Jewish product, Lutterbeck, Zeller, Mangold and Holtzmann, following the precedent of Baur and Gfrörer, explain some more, some fewer, of the peculiarities which distinguish Essenism from traditional Judaism, by the influence of Pythagoreanism, with which Josephus (*Antt.* xv. 10. 4) had already compared Essenism. It was especially Zeller, who in his discussions with Ritschl sought, on the basis of his comprehensive acquaintance with Greek philosophy, to point out parallels with Pythagoreanism in nearly all points. Herzfeld occupied a medium position, by finding that in

δὲ τὸ Γυμνοσοφιστῶν, . . . Ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ Παλαιστίνη [καὶ] Συρία καλοκάγαθίας οὐκ ἄγονος κ.τ.λ.).

[87] This place, Essa west of the Dead Sea, has been fabricated by Hilgenfeld purely *ad hoc*. He is himself only able to point out an Ἔσσα in Peraea, which is identical with Gerasa (Joseph. *Antt.* xiii. 15. 3, comp. with *Bell. Jud.* i. 4. 8). He thinks however that the name means "foundation," and may therefore occur as the name of several places. But unfortunately this Ἔσσα in Peraea does not exist at all, since the reading must be Γέρασα, by reason of *Bell. Jud.* i. 4–8, and also the parallel passage, *Antt.* xiii. 15. 3. Comp. note 257, vol. i. p. 117.

Essenism "a Judaism of quite peculiarly blended ultra-Pharisaic and Alexandrinian views appears in alliance with Pythagoreanism and with many rites of Egyptian priests" (iii. 369). Keim too is of opinion, that while all the peculiarities of Essenism might be derived from Judaism, the parallels between Pythagoreanism and Essenism are too numerous and striking to suffer us to dispute the influence of the former upon the latter (*Gesch. Jesu*, i. 300 sqq.).

It is not easy to find a way out of this labyrinth of views. The question will be simplified by first subjecting to an examination the peculiar hypotheses of Ritschl, Lucius, and Hilgenfeld. 1. The hypothesis of Ritschl is tempting, inasmuch as the Essenes certainly desire to exhibit, like the Israelitish priests, a condition of special purity and holiness. Hence the parallels between the two are very numerous. On the other hand however it leaves essential points unexplained, especially their rejection of animal sacrifices, marriage, the oath, and the anointing oil.[88] It is impossible to deduce all these phenomena satisfactorily from a single standpoint. 2. And still less is this the case if the point is that chosen by Lucius. His attempt to explain all the singularities of the Essenes by their rupture with the illegitimate worship at Jerusalem may be designated a failure. For how should they have thus arrived at their rejection of marriage, oaths, slavery, trading, and their peculiarly puritanical tendency in general?[89] In other respects too this starting-point is unfortunately chosen. For if the Essenes agreed, as Lucius admits, with the Pharisees in their legalistic tendencies, they had, at least after the time of Alexandra, no longer any reason for withdrawing from the temple-worship, since all sacred rites were then performed in

[88] Comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 413 sqq. *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 315 sqq.

[89] Against Lucius, see also my notice in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, 492–496.

a thoroughly correct manner. 3. The same objections as those against Ritschl and Lucius virtually apply to Hilgenfeld's earlier view of the Essenes as a community of Apocalyptics. Here too several peculiarities are left unexplained.[90] *If Essenism in general can be regarded as a purely Jewish formation, it is certainly most simple to view it as a climax of the Pharisaic tendency,* for its starting-point and many of its peculiarities are identical with those of the latter. Hence the question may be simplified to: *Is Essenism nothing more than a peculiar offshoot of Pharisaism, or did foreign and alien influences co-operate in its origin and development?* And if the latter question be answered in the affirmative, what were these influences, Buddhism (as in Hilgenfeld's earlier view), Parseeism (Hilgenfeld and Lightfoot), Syro-Palestinian heathenism (Lipsius), or lastly, the Orpheo-Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks (Zeller and others)?

It cannot be denied that very many, nay, most particulars may be explained from the Judaeo-Pharisaic basis. Two main features especially, *the rigid legalism* and *the punctilious care for ceremonial cleanness,* are genuinely Pharisaic. Their high regard for the great lawgiver *Moses* and for the Holy Scriptures, their strict, nay, rigorous Sabbath-keeping, place them completely on the soil of Judaism. Their non-observance of certain precepts of the law, those especially concerning animal sacrifices, may have been the result either of some case of necessity or of an allegorical interpretation of the laws in question. In any case, it is not inconsistent with their unconditional acknowledgment of the formal authority of the law. Then their punctilious care for purity is essentially Pharisaic. The value attributed to Levitical purity, and to the baths and lustrations by which this was restored when defilement had been incurred, is a characteristic of Pharisaism.[91]

[90] Comp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 315 sqq.

[91] Tertullian, *De baptismo*, c. 15: Ceterum Israel Judaeus *quotidie lavat*,

Especially is the Essenian bathing before meals analogous to practices of Pharisaic Judaism, and is at most an increase of the Pharisaic custom.[92] Bathing after the performance of natural functions was required at least of officiating priests.[93] If then this was required by the Essenes of all the members of their association, it only shows that they desired to realize in themselves the highest degree of purity according to Jewish notions. We are also vividly reminded of Pharisaic views by the Essenian custom of bathing even after contact with a member of the order of a lower grade (*i.e.* a novice). For just what the unclean Am-haarez was to the Pharisees, was the novice not actually admitted into the society to the Essenes. *Essenism then is in the first place merely Pharisaism in the superlative degree.* From the effort to carry out completely the purity of life thus required may be explained also the Essenian *separation*, their *organization in narrow and exclusive communities.* If the Pharisee avoided as much as possible all intercourse with the unclean Am-haarez, the Essene completely separated himself from the multitude and formed exclusive societies, in which similarity of disposition and endeavour afforded the possibility of realizing the ideal of a

quia quotidie inquinatur. When Hemerobaptists (= *καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτιζόμενοι*) are mentioned by Epiphanius, *haer.* xvii., as a Jewish sect, we have but the fabrication of a special sectarian name from a characteristic peculiarity of *all* Jews.

[92] Ev. Mark vii. 3, 4: *οἱ γὰρ Φαρισαῖοι καὶ πάντες οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἐὰν μὴ πυγμῇ νίψωνται τὰς χεῖρας οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν . . . καὶ ἀπ' ἀγορᾶς ἐὰν μὴ ῥαντίσωνται* (*al.* *βαπτίσωνται*) *οὐκ ἐσθίουσιν.* Comp. also Matt. xv. 2; Luke xi. 38. *Chagigah* ii. 5: "For the partaking of Chullin (profane food), tithe and heave, the hands must be washed (properly poured upon); for the eating of holy things they must first be dipped" (the latter precept applies only to those who partake of "holy" food, *i.e.* food proceeding from sacrifices). Comp. also p. 111. Bathing the whole body before eating cannot be shown to be a general precept in Rabbinic literature. The interpretation of the New Testament passages is questionable.

[93] *Joma* iii. 2. Comp. concerning the cleanness required of the priests, vol. i. p. 278.

life of absolute ceremonial cleanness. The *common meals* of these societies, the food for which was prepared by the priests, were a guarantee to the Essene that only clean food would be set before him. This close brotherly connection led to *community of goods.* The strict requirements made from members of the order made it necessary to admit new members into the society only after a long and strict *novitiate.* The purity and holiness which the Essenes strove to realize were indeed different, more exalted and special than those of the Pharisees. But almost all their peculiarities had at least their starting-point in Pharisaism. Their *white raiment* corresponded with the official dress of Israelitish priests, and therefore only shows, that the Essenes desired to manifest the highest degree of Jewish purity and holiness.[94] . . . Their *caution* in bathing,[95] and even their custom of not spitting forwards or to the right has its analogues in the Talmud.[96] Their *repudiation of marriage* is indeed a matter quite heterogeneous to genuine Judaism.[97] But even this may be explained from Jewish premises. For since the act of marriage as such made an individual unclean and necessitated a Levitical bath of purification,[98] the effort to attain to the highest degree of

[94] According to *Berachoth* 61b, it was forbidden to perform the functions of nature towards the east or the west (it was allowed only towards the north or the south) to prevent exposure towards the temple.

[95] According to Mishna, *Berachoth* iii. 5, if any one happened to be bathing at the time for praying the Shema, and had not time to rise up and clothe himself, he must at least cover himself with water. *Bab. Berachoth* 24b requires of any one unclothed before praying the Shema to wind the Tallith round his neck or his heart, that the upper parts of his body may not see the shame. See Herzfeld, iii. 389. Comp. also Lucius, p. 68.

[96] According to *Jer. Berachoth* iii. 5, it was forbidden to spit forwards or to the right at prayer; see Herzfeld, iii. 387. This custom is observed to this very day.

[97] Comp. on the *debitum tori*, *Jebamoth* vi. 6: "No one must withdraw from the duty of propagation, unless he has children already, according to the school of Shammai two sons, according to that of Hillel at least a son and daughter." Also *Kethuboth* v. 6, 7; *Gittin* iv. 5; *Edujoth* i. 13, iv. 10.

[98] Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 24: καὶ μετὰ τὴν νόμιμον συνουσίαν ἀνδρὸς καὶ

purity might well lead to the entire repudiation of marriage. In all these points a surpassing of ordinary Judaism is apparent, and this is also the case in the strongly puritanical trait, by which the Essenian mode of life is characterized. They saw in many of the social customs and institutions, which the development of culture entailed, a perversion of the primitive and simple ways of life prescribed by nature. They thought therefore that they manifested true morality by *a return to the simplicity of nature and of natural ordinances.* Hence their rejection of *slavery, oaths, anointing oil, and of luxury* in general; hence their principle of living a simple life and allowing themselves only so much food and drink as nature required. It cannot be shown that they practised actual asceticism by fastings and mortifications, by abstinence from flesh and wine. It was only the exceeding what nature required that they condemned.[99] *Their rejection of trade* is quite in accordance with this ethic radicalism; they desired a communistic state, in which each worked for the whole body, and none enriched himself at the expense of others.

If the bounds of ordinary Judaism are exceeded by the traits already depicted, this is still more the case in the extremely striking fact of the repudiation of animal sacrifices. That the point of view set up by Lucius in explanation of this fact does not lead to the goal, has been already remarked.[100] The sole point of contact for it, on Jewish ground, seems to me, on the contrary, to be the contention of many of the prophets against the over-estimation of sacrifice. As the prophets insist, that God does not take

γυναικὸς ἀπολούσασθαι κελεύει ὁ νόμος. Comp. Ex. xix. 15; Lev. xv. 16–18; Deut. xxiii. 11, 12.

[99] The prohibition of the use of anointing oil during the stricter kinds of fasts by Pharisaic Judaism (*Taanith* i. 6; *Joma* viii. 1; comp. Dan. x. 3; Matt. vi. 17) does not therefore fall under quite the same point of view. It was to be a total abstinence.

[100] Comp. also *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1881, p. 494.

pleasure in sacrifices, but in purity of intention, so, according to the Essenian view, not the slaughter of beasts, but the sanctification of the body is true worship.

This also is based upon a certain amount of moral radicalism. But the rejection of animal sacrifices involves a complete *breach with Judaism proper*, which is not done away with by the fact, that the Essenes used to send gifts of incense to the temple at Jerusalem. A still stranger phenomenon presented on Jewish soil is their peculiar conduct with respect to the sun. It is quite impossible that their εὐχὴ εἰς τὸν ἥλιον can be only the Jewish Shema repeated before sunrise;[101] on the contrary, they turned towards the sun while praying, because they saw in it the representative of the Divine light. This is proved especially by the circumstance, that in doing their needs they carefully avoided uncovering themselves towards the sun. The information too of Epiphanius, that the Ossaians (who are certainly identical with the Essenes) had united with the Sampsitae, *i.e.* adorers of the sun, leads to the conclusion, that they were in real earnest in their religious estimation of the sun.[102] However this may be, the very turning to the sun in prayer was contrary to Jewish customs and notions, which on the contrary required the turning to the temple, and expressly repudiated the direction towards the sun as heathenish.[103]

[101] So most Jewish scholars, also Derenbourg, p. 169, note 3. Comp. on saying the Shema before sunrise, *Berachoth* i. 2, and on the Shema in general, p. 83 sq.

[102] See Epiphanius, *haer.* xx. 3: καὶ Ὀσσαίων τὸ λεῖμμα οὐκέτι ἰουδαΐζον, ἀλλὰ συναφθὲν Σαμψίταις τοῖς κατὰ διαδοχὴν ἐν τῷ πέραν τῆς νεκρᾶς θαλάσσης ὑπερκειμένοις. Comp. also Epiphan. *haer.* xix. 2, liii. 1–2. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., 2nd ed. pp. 88, 374 sq. The identity of the Essenes and Ossaians is scarcely doubtful, though Epiphanius treats them as two different sects, *haer.* x. and xix. (Lightfoot, p. 83). He correctly explains (*haer.* liii. 2) the name Σαμψαῖοι by Ἡλιακοί (from שמש, the sun).

[103] See especially Ezek. viii. 16 sqq. According to *Sukka* v. 4, two priests used to blow with trumpets in the morning at cock-crowing at the

Thus are we more and more driven to the view, that foreign influences co-operated in the formation of Essenism. And this becomes undoubted, if the account given of its *Anthropology* by Josephus is even in the main trustworthy. For if it really taught the pre-existence of the soul and regarded the body as only the soul's prison, this is of itself a proof of the influence of foreign philosophemes. Thus the question concerning the origin of Essenism is changed into the question concerning the trustworthiness of Josephus. This is not indeed utterly above suspicion, and we have already seen (above, p. 16 sq.), that he has given a Greek tinge to the teaching of the Pharisees and clothed their Jewish doctrine in a Greek garment. But we also saw that all that he says of them is in substance true, and that it is only the form which is derived from without. If then only one sentence which he says concerning the anthropology of the Essenes is true, it is certain that their doctrine of man is dualistic, *i.e.* non-Jewish. And there is the less ground for doubting this, since from this point of view many of their peculiarities, especially their efforts after purity, surpassing as they did even those of Phariseeism, are most simply and naturally explained.

*But what foreign influences have we then to consider?* No

feast of Tabernacles, first of all at the door which led from the court of the men to the court of the women, then at the eastern door of exit from the latter; hereupon they turned towards the west (*i.e.* towards the temple) and said, with reference to Ezek. viii. 16: "Our fathers, who were in this place, turned their backs to the temple of God and their faces to the east and worshipped the sun towards the east. But we turn our eyes to God." When it is said in the Wisdom of Solomon, that we ought to prevent the sun with thanksgiving to God, and to pray to God *πρὸς ἀνατολὴν φωτός*, *πρός* has not a local but a temporal meaning: "towards sunrise," like Luke xxiv. 29, *πρὸς ἑσπέραν*; comp. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu Sap. Sal.* xvi. 28. The matter too adduced by Lucius (pp. 61, 69 sq., note 125) to explain Essenian customs from a Jewish standpoint is not convincing. Its irrelevance is well pointed out by Lightfoot (pp. 374–376), who conjectures that the Sampsitae are merely an offshoot of the Essenes.

less than four different factors have been proposed, viz. Buddhism, Parseeism, Syrian heathenism, and Pythagoreanism. Each of these factors *may* in fact have exerted an influence upon intellectual life in Palestine during the last centuries before Christ; and for this very reason an answer to the above question must remain an uncertain one. Buddhism seems the most far-fetched. But when we consider, that an acquaintance with India had already been opened to the Western nations by the victories of Alexander the Great, that afterwards Megasthenes, in the time of Seleucus I. Nicator, *i.e.* about 300 B.C., furnished, on the ground of his own observations during a prolonged sojourn in India, a thorough description of the country and its inhabitants,[104] and that a regular commercial intercourse with India by way of the Red Sea probably existed during the Graeco-Roman period,[105] when also the striking parallel in some instances between Buddhism

[104] See the extensive fragments of Megasthenes in Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* ii. 397–439. Comp. also concerning him Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1721. Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 170 sq. The work of Megasthenes seems to have been for a long time the main source of information concerning India. Strabo however availed himself also of other authors of the retinue of Alexander the Great as authorities (*e.g.* Aristobulus, Nearchus, Onesikritus). For other Ἰνδικά, see Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 688b below; Nicolai, *Griech. Literaturgesch.* ii. 170 sq. That certain chief points were matters of general knowledge is seen from Philo, *Quod omnis probus liber*, § 11. Josephus, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7 (ed. Bekker, p. 160, lin. 20 sqq.). Lassen in his *Indische Alterthumskunde*, vol. ii. (2nd ed. 1874) pp. 626–751, gives a history of Greek acquaintance with India. Comp. the careful discussion in Lightfoot's *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., pp. 390–396, and the two works cited by him, viz. Reinand, *Relations Politiques et Commerciales de l'empire romain avec l'Asie centrale*, Paris 1863; and Priaulx, *The Indian Travels of Apollonius of Tyana and the Indian Embassies to Rome*, 1873.

[105] Comp. especially the *Periplus maris Erythraei* mentioned above, pp. 37 and 44, and the literature cited in the preceding note. In the time of Augustus political embassies also came from India to Rome (*Monumentum Ancyranum*, v. 50, 51, and Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, 1883, p. 132 sq. Strabo, xv. 1. 4, p. 686, and xv. 1. 73, p. 719. Dio Cass. liv. 9. Sueton. *Aug.* 21. Orosius, vi. 21. 19).

and Essenism is considered, the *possibility* at least of an actual connection cannot be disputed. It is true, that the still very scanty intercourse between India and the West in pre-Christian times makes this connection improbable.[106] It is more obvious to think of Parseeism or Pythagoreanism; for the points of contact with Syrian heathenism are but very general, and affect at most only individual details. In *Parseeism*, on the other hand, we find a whole series of the characteristic peculiarities of the Essenes: the lustrations, the white garments (for the Magi), the adoration of the sun, the repudiation of animal sacrifices proper (*i.e.* the presentation of the flesh to the Deity), and especially their angelology and magic. Since too ordinary Judaism seems to have been affected by Parseeism (see vol. i. p. 350), the assumption of Parsee influence is a very obvious one, since it would be only somewhat stronger in Essenism than in the latter.[107] But other points again are not at all Parseeistic, especially celibacy and the entire anthropology.[108] Hence all things considered, the hypothesis adopted especially by Zeller, that the peculiarities of Essenism are to be explained from Pythagorean influences, has the largest amount of probability in its favour. For Pythagoreanism, of all the hitherto named tendencies, shows the greater number of parallels with

[106] See, on the other hand, Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 323. Lightfoot, *St. Paul's Epistles to the Colossians*, etc., pp. 390–396. The attempts recently made to point out Indian influences in other departments also are questionable, nay, more than questionable. This applies especially to Seydel, *Das Evangelium von Jesu in seinen Verhältnissen zu Buddha-Sage und Buddha-Lehre*, Leipzig 1882 (on the other hand, *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1882, p. 415 sqq.). The same, *Die Buddha-Legende und das Leben Jesu nach den Evangelien*, Leipzig 1884 (on the other hand, *Theol. Litztg.* 1884, p. 185 sqq.). On Pythagoras, Schroeder, *Pythagoras und die Inder*, Leipzig 1884 (on the other hand, A. W. in the *Lit. Centralbl.* 1884, No. 45).

[107] See Hilgenfeld, *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1867, p. 99 sqq. The same, *Ketzergeschichte des Urchristenthums*, p. 141 sqq. Lightfoot, p. 387 sqq.

[108] See Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2. 320 sqq.

Essenism. It shares its aspirations for bodily purity and sanctity, its lustrations, its simple habits of life apart from all sensual enjoyments, its high estimation (if not exactly its requirement) of celibacy, its white garments, repudiation of oaths, and especially its rejection of bloody sacrifices, also the invocation of the sun and the scrupulosity with which all that was unclean (such as human excrements) was hidden from it;[109] and lastly, the dualistic view of the relation of soul and body. All these belong equally to the ideal of both the Essenes and Pythagoreans.[110] If an actual connection between the two is by reason of this far-reaching accordance, to say the least, very probable, this probability is increased by the fact, that a new light is thus cast upon even those peculiarities of Essenism, which may be explained from a Jewish foundation. They thus become, not the result of a spontaneous development, but of a fertilization of Judaism by new factors. These latter exercised a power of attraction over Judaism, because they found therein a series of points of contact for their own elective affinity.

Such an influence of Pythagoreanism upon a Jewish circle, leading to the formation of this separate sect upon Jewish soil, is historically easy of explanation. Essenism is met with at the earliest about the middle of the second century before Christ. But Pythagoreanism, if not as a settled school of philosophy, still as a view of life and a practice of morals, is far more ancient. As then Greek culture must have had a powerful influence upon Palestine since the time of Alexander

[109] That the adoration of the sun formed part of the Pythagorean ideal is seen especially from the biography of Apollonius of Tyana by Philostratus (comp. Zeller, *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 155, note 1). The effort too to avoid the sight of what was unclean is genuinely Pythagorean. Comp. Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 425. Mangold, *Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, p. 52.

[110] See the proofs in Zeller, *Theol. Jahrb.* 1856, p. 401 sqq.; *Philosophie der Griechen*, iii. 2, p. 325 sqq.

the Great,—it was not repressed until the Maccabaean rising, —it is only natural, if we find actual proof of this influence of Hellenism in the circle of the Essenes. *Thus Essenism would be a separation from the soil of Judaism proper, which was perhaps effected in the second century before Christ, under Greek influences, with the view of realizing an ideal akin to Pythagoreanism, but with an adherence to its Jewish foundation.*[111]

One thing alone prevents our establishing this result with certainty, and this is the enigmatical form of Pythagoreanism itself. Just those peculiarities, which it has in common with Essenism, are themselves not genuinely Greek, but *very probably of Oriental origin.* May not then their coincidence be explained by the fact, that each of the two has independently drawn from a common Oriental source? This would again lead to a derivation of Essenism mainly from Parsee influences. The possibility of this cannot be denied. But possibly both Parsee and Pythagorean influences were in operation. The different currents of culture frequently cross each other on the soil of Western Asia in so chequered and manifold a manner that it is impossible to answer such questions with certainty. Two things however may be established as the result of our investigation: (1) That Essenism is first and mainly a *Jewish* formation; and (2) that in its non-Jewish features it has most affinity with the Pythagorean tendency of the Greeks.

[111] The question whether the *Therapeutae* were offshoots of the Essenes or *vice versa* (answered by Zeller at first in the former, but subsequently in the latter sense) must now be left undiscussed, since the only work which gives us any information concerning the Therapeutae, viz. Philo, *De vita contemplativa* (Mang. ii. 471–486), is certainly spurious, and the Therapeutae very probably merely Christian monks. See below, § 34. 1.

## § 31. JUDAISM IN THE DISPERSION. PROSELYTES.

### The Literature.


Remond, *Versuch einer Geschichte der Ausbreitung des Judenthums von Cyrus bis auf den gänzlichen Untergang des Jüdischen Staats*, Leipzig 1789.

Gieseler, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, vol. i. Div. i. (4th ed. 1844) p. 53 sqq.

Winer, *RWB.*, art. "Exil" (i. 357–360) and "Zerstreuung" (ii. 727–730). Also the articles on separate cities, as "Alexandria," "Antiochia," "Cyrene," "Rom," etc.

J. G. M(üller), art. "Alexandrinische Juden," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. i. (1854) pp. 235–239.

Reuss, art. "Hellenisten," in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. v. 701–705 (2nd ed. v. 738–741).

Lutterbeck, *Die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, vol. i. (1852) pp. 89–120.

Frankel, *Die Diaspora zur Zeit des zweiten Tempels* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1853, pp. 409–429, 449–463).

Frankel, *Die Juden unter den ersten römischen Kaisern* (*Monatsschr.* 1854, pp. 401–413, 439–450).

Jost, *Gesch. der Israeliten*, vol. ii. pp. 239–344. The same, *Gesch. des Judenthums und seiner Secten*, vol. i. pp. 336 sqq., 344–361, 367–379.

Herzfeld, *Gesch. des Volkes Jisrael*, vol. iii. pp. 425–579. The same, *Handelsgeschichte der Juden des Alterthums*, 1879.

Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, vol. iii. 3rd ed. (1878), pp. 26–54.

Champagny, *Rome et la Judée au temps de la chute de Néron*, vol. i. (Paris 1865) pp. 107–154.

Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. iv. p. 305 sqq., v. 108 sqq., vi. 396 sqq.

Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, vol. ii. pp. 38–52, 253–273.

Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. vol. ii. 91–145, iii. 383–392.

Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, vol. iii. (1871) pp. 504–517. The same, *De Judaeorum coloniis*. Regimonti Pr. 1876 (*Progr.*).

Deutsch, art. "Dispersion," in Kitto's *Cyclopaedia of Biblical Literature.*
Westcott, art. "Dispersion," in Smith's *Dictionary of the Bible.*
Weizsäcker, art. "Zerstreuung," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* v. 712–716.
Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome B.C. 76 to A.D. 140*, New York 1876 (comp *Theol. Litztg.* 1877, p. 163).
Hamburger, *Real-Encyclopädie für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii. (1883) art. "Zehn Stämme," "Zerstreuung," also "Alexandria," "Antiochia," "Rom," etc.

## I. EXTENSION.

The history of the Jews during the times of Christ is not confined to the narrow limits of the Holy Land. Jewish communities of greater or less magnitude and importance had settled in almost all the countries of the then civilised world. These remained, on the one hand, in constant communication with the mother country, and on the other, in active intercourse with the non-Jewish world, and thus became of great importance both in respect of the internal development of Judaism and its influence upon other civilised nations. The *causes of this dispersion* were of very different kinds. In former times the Assyrian and Babylonian conquerors of Israel violently deported large masses of the nation into their eastern provinces. This occurred again, though to a less extent, when Pompey *e.g.* carried off hundreds of Jewish captives to Rome. Of greater importance however were the voluntary emigrations of Jewish settlers during the Graeco-Roman period to the countries bordering on Palestine, and to all the chief towns of the then civilised world for the sake chiefly of trade. It was especially at the commencement of the Hellenistic period, that these migrations were most numerous. The Diadochoi and their successors, for the sake of consolidating their kingdoms, promoted to the uttermost of their power the intermingling of the different nationalities, and consequently migrations from one province to another. They were also frequently in need

of great masses of settlers for their newly founded towns. And in both of these interests the rights of citizenship or other privileges were in many places granted without further ceremony to immigrants. Attracted by these circumstances, large numbers of Jews also were induced to settle in other lands. Adverse events at home may also have contributed their part, and especially the exposed situation of Palestine, which in all complications between Egyyt and Syria became the scene of war. This induced many thousand Jews to emigrate to the neighbouring countries of Syria and Egypt, where, especially in the capitals Antioch and Alexandria, and in all the newly founded Hellenistic cities, valuable privileges were bestowed upon them. They next resorted to Asia Minor, particularly the towns of the Ionic coast, as well as to all the more important ports and commercial cities of the Mediterranean Sea.

Hence the Sibyllist was able, about the year 140 B.C., to say of the Jewish people, that every land and every sea was filled with them.[1] About the same time (139–138 B.C.) the Roman Senate despatched a circular in favour of the Jews to the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamos, Cappadocia and Parthia, and to a great number of provinces, towns and islands of the Mediterranean Sea (1 Macc. xv. 16–24). It may hence be safely inferred, that there was then already a greater or less number of Jews in all these lands.[2a] Strabo, speaking of the time of Sulla, says (about 85 B.C.), that the Jewish people had already come into every city, and that it was not easy to find

[1] *Orac. Sibyll.* iii. 271: Πᾶσα δὲ γαῖα σέθεν πλήρης καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα.

[2a] Besides the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamos, Cappadocia and Parthia, there are also named in 1 Macc. xv. 16–24: Sampsame (Samsun on the Black Sea?), Sparta, Sicyon (in Peloponnesus), the islands of Delos and Samos, the town of Gortyna in Crete, the country of Caria with the towns of Myndos, Halicarnassus and Cnidos, the islands of Cos and Rhodes, the country of Lycia with the town of Phasaelis, the country of Pamphylia with the town Side, the Phoenician town Aradus, and finally Cyprus and Cyrene.

a place in the world which had not received this race, and was not occupied by them.[2b] Josephus[3] too and Philo[4] express themselves incidentally in a similar manner. The extent of the Jewish dispersion is most amply described in the epistle of Agrippa to Caligula, given by Philo. Jerusalem—it is here said—is the capital not only of Judaea, but of most countries, by reason of the colonies which it has sent out on fitting occasions into the neighbouring lands of Egypt, Phoenicia, Syria, Coelesyria, and the still more remote Pamphylia and Cilicia, into most parts of Asia as far as Bithynia, and into the most distant corners of Pontus; also to Europe, Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Etolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, and the most and best parts of Peloponnesus. And not only is the continent full of Jewish settlements, but also the more important islands,—Euboea, Cyprus, Crete,—to say nothing of the lands beyond the Euphrates. For all, with the exception of a small portion of Babylon and those satrapies which embrace the fertile land lying around it, have Jewish inhabitants.[5] The Acts of the Apostles also mention Jews and their associates from Parthia, Media, Elam, and Mesopotamia, from Cappadocia, Pontus and Asia, Phrygia and Pamphylia,

[2b] Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: εἰς πᾶσαν πόλιν ἤδη παρεληλύθει, καὶ τύπον οὐκ ἔστι ῥᾳδίως εὑρεῖν τῆς οἰκουμένης ὃς οὐ παραδέδεκται τοῦτο τὸ φῦλον, μηδ' ἐπικρατεῖται ὑπ' αὐτοῦ.

[3] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 16. 4 (Bekker, p. 188): οὐ γὰρ ἔστιν ἐπὶ τῆς οἰκουμένης δῆμος ὁ μὴ μοῖραν ὑμετέραν ἔχων. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων γένος πολὺ μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην παρέσπαρται τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις.

[4] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 7 (Mang. ii. 524): Ἰουδαίους γὰρ χώρα μία διὰ πολυανθρωπίαν οὐ χωρεῖ. Ἧς αἰτίας ἕνεκα τὰς πλείστας καὶ εὐδαιμονεστάτας τῶν ἐν Εὐρώπῃ καὶ Ἀσίᾳ κατά τε νήσους καὶ ἠπείρους ἐκτέμονται, μητρόπολιν μὲν τὴν Ἱερόπολιν ἡγούμενοι, καθ' ἣν ἵδρυται ὁ τοῦ ὑψίστου θεοῦ νεὼς ἅγιος· ἃς δ' ἔλαχον ἐκ πατέρων καὶ πάππων καὶ προπάππων καὶ τῶν ἔτι ἄνω προγόνων οἰκεῖν ἕκαστοι, πατρίδας νομίζοντες, ἐν αἷς ἐγεννήθησαν καὶ ἐτράφησαν· εἰς ἐνίας δὲ καὶ κτιζομένας ἰοῦσι ἦλθον ἀποικίαν στειλάμενοι, τοῖς κτίσταις χαριζόμενοι.

[5] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 36, Mang. ii. 587.

Egypt and Cyrene, from Rome, Crete and Arabia (Acts ii. 9–11).

In Mesopotamia, Media, and Babylonia lived the descendants of those members of the kingdom of the ten tribes and of the kingdom of Judah who had once been carried away thither by the Assyrians and Chaldeans.[6] The "ten tribes" never returned at all from captivity,[7] and even in the times of Akiba there were disputes as to whether they would ever do so.[8] Nor must the return of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin be conceived of as complete. Nay, these exiles subsequently received fresh accessions. For the Persian king Artaxerxes Ochus, on his return from his Egyptian campaign (about 340 B.C.), brought with him Jewish captives also, and planted them in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea.[9] These Jewish settlements may also have been increased by voluntary additions. From all these causes the Jews in those provinces were numbered, not by thousands, but by millions.[10] Since

[6] Comp. on the different deportations, Winer, *Realwörterb.*, art. "Exil." On the localities, see note 14, below.

[7] Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 5. 2. 4 Ezra xiii. 39-47. Origen, *Epist. ad Africanum*, § 14.

[8] *Sanhedrin* x. 3, *fin.*: "The ten tribes never return, for it is said of them (Deut. xxix. 27): He will cast them into another land, as it is this day. As then this day departs and never returns, so too are they to depart and never return. As the day becomes dark and then again light, so will it one day be light again to the ten tribes with whom it was dark."

[9] Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 486: Ὦχος Ἀρταξέρξου παῖς εἰς Αἴγυπτον στρατεύων μερικὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν εἶλεν Ἰουδαίων, ὧν τοὺς μὲν ἐν Ὑρκανίᾳ κατῴκισε πρὸς τῇ Κασπίᾳ θαλάσσῃ, τοὺς δὲ ἐν Βαβυλῶνι, οἳ καὶ μέχρι νῦν εἰσιν αὐτόθι, ὡς πολλοὶ τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἱστοροῦσιν. Orosius, iii. 7: Tunc etiam Ochus, qui et Artaxerxes, post transactum in Aegypto maximum diuturnumque bellum plurimos Judaeorum in transmigrationem egit atque in Hyrcania ad Caspium mare habitare praecepit: quos ibi usque in hodiernum diem amplissimi generis sui incrementis consistere atque exim quandoque erupturos opinio est. Kürzer in the *Chronik des Eusebius und Hieronymus ad annum Abr.* 1657 (ed. Schoene, ii. 112 sq.). Syncellus alone speaks of a settlement in Babylon; other authorities mention only the settlement in Hyrcania on the Caspian Sea.

[10] Joseph. *Antt.* xi. 5. 2: Αἱ δὲ δέκα φυλαὶ πέραν εἰσὶν Εὐφράτου ἕως δεῦρο,

they dwelt on the eastern borders of the Roman Empire,—till Trajan, as subjects of the Parthians, and subsequently as inhabitants of those eastern provinces which could never be securely maintained by the Romans,[11]—their attitude was always of political importance to the empire. P. Petronius, legate of Syria, esteemed it dangerous in the year 40 B.C. to excite in them a hostile disposition towards Rome.[12] During the Vespasian war the insurgents sought to incite their co-religionists beyond the Euphrates to hostilities against Rome.[13] It was a great peril for Trajan in his advance against the Parthians to be menaced in his rear by the insurrection of the Mesopotamian Jews (see § 21). Josephus names the strong cities of Nehardea (*Νάαρδα*) and Nisibis, the former on the Euphrates, the latter in its valley, as the chief dwelling places of the Babylonian and Mesopotamian Jews.[14] Both

*μυριάδες ἄπειροι καὶ ἀριθμῷ γνωσθῆναι μὴ δυνάμεναι. Antt.* xv. 2. 2: *ἐν Βαβυλῶνι . . . ἔνθα καὶ πλῆθος ἦν Ἰουδαίων.* On the history of the Babylonian Jews, comp. especially *Antt.* xviii. 9. Reference is sometimes at least made in the Mishna to the Jews of Babylonia and Media. See *Shekalim* iii. 4 (the half-shekel tax of Babylonia and Media); *Challa* iv. 11 (the first-born not accepted from Babylonia); *Joma* vi. 4 (the Babylonians plucked the wool of the scape-goat on the day of atonement); *Menachoth* xi. 7 (Babylonian priests); *Baba mezia* iv. 7, *Shabbath* vi. 6 (Median Jewesses); *Baba kamma* ix. 5 = *Baba mezia* iv. 7 (restitution for plundered property is binding as far as Media); *Shabbath* ii. 1, *Nasir* v. 4, *Baba bathra* v. 2 (Nahum the Mede). The Book of Tobit also proves that Jews dwelt in Media (Tob. i. 14, iii. 7, etc.).

[11] On the political history, see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, vol. i. (1881) pp. 435–438.

[12] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 33, Mang. ii. 578.

[13] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2 (p. 108, line 19 sq., ed. Bekker). Titus reproaches the Jews that *καὶ πρεσβεῖαι μὲν ὑμῶν πρὸς τοὺς ὑπὲρ Εὐφράτην ἐπὶ νεωτερισμῷ.*

[14] Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1 and 9, *fin.* On Nehardea (נהרדעא), see Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 375 sq. (*s.v.* Naarda). Ritter, *Erdkunde*, x. 146. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, ii. 852 sq. On Nisbis, Pauly's *Real-Enc.* v. 659 sq. Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xi. 413 sqq. Nisibis was not on the Euphrates, as might appear from Josephus, but on the Mygdonius, an affluent of the Chaboras, which again is an affluent of the Euphrates. It formed the centre of the localities mentioned 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11, to which the members

cities were in subsequent centuries chief seats of Talmudic Judaism, and are therefore frequently mentioned in the Babylonian Talmud.[15]

Josephus names Syria as the country in which was the largest percentage of Jewish inhabitants, and its capital, Antioch, was especially distinguished in this respect.[16] Other cities of Syria also numbered their Jewish inhabitants by thousands; this was the case with Damascus, where, according to the statement of Josephus, 10,000 or (according to another passage) 18,000 Jews are said to have been assassinated at the time of the war.[17] Philo tells us of Asia also, as of Syria, that Jews dwelt in *large numbers in every city*.[18] Aristotle, during his sojourn in Asia Minor (348–345 B.C.), had a meeting with an educated Jew, who had come thither, who *Ἑλληνικὸς ἦν οὐ τῇ διαλέκτῳ μόνον ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ψυχῇ*. Clearchus, a disciple of Aristotle, gives in his book on sleep further particulars concerning this

of the kingdom of the ten tribes were carried by the Assyrians (see Gesenius' *Thesaurus*, and Winer's *Realwörterbuch* on the articles חֲלַח, חָבוֹר, גּוֹזָן, מָדַי, Halach, Habor, Gozan, Media; and the commentaries on 2 Kings xvii. 6, xviii. 11). Nehardea, on the other hand, lay farther southward in Babylonia proper. Thus *around Nisibis were grouped the descendants of the ten tribes, and around Nehardea the descendants of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah*, increased in both instances by subsequent additions. For Rabbinical matter on the abode of the ten tribes, see Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr. in epist.* 1 *ad Corinthios*, addenda ad c. xiv. (*Opp.* ed. Roterodam. ii. 929–932); Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 1281 sqq. (art. "Zehn Stämme"). Comp. also 4 Ezra xiii. 39–47, and above, p. 170.

[15] See Berliner *Beiträge zur Geographie und Ethnographie Babyloniens im Talmud und Midrash* (Berlin 1884), pp. 47 sqq., 53 sq. נהרדעא is also already mentioned in the Mishna, *Jebamoth* xvi. 7.

[16] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: *Τὸ γὰρ Ἰουδαίων γένος πολὺ μὲν κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην παρέσπαρται τοῖς ἐπιχωρίοις, πλεῖστον δὲ τῇ Συρίᾳ κατὰ τὴν γειτνίασιν ἀναμεμιγμένον, ἐξαιρέτως δ' ἐπὶ τῆς Ἀντιοχείας ἦν πολὺ διὰ τὸ τῆς πόλεως μέγεθος.* Comp. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. s.v.* Antiochien.

[17] 10,000, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2. 18,000, *Bell. Jud.* vii. 8. 7 (p. 161, 27, ed. Bekker).

[18] Philo, *ad Legat. Cajum*, § 33, Mang. ii. 582: *Ἰουδαῖοι καθ' ἑκάστην πόλιν εἰσὶ παμπληθεῖς Ἀσίας τε καὶ Συρίας.*

meeting.[19] Antiochus the Great settled 2000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylonia in Phrygia and Lydia.[20] And to mention nothing else, the Roman edicts in favour of the Jews communicated by Josephus (*Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6), and the entire history of the Apostle Paul, show how widely the Jews had spread over the whole of Asia Minor. The statement of Agrippa in his epistle cited above, that Jews had settled in Bithynia and in the most distant corners of Pontus,[21] is abundantly confirmed by the Jewish inscriptions in the Greek language found in the Crimea.[22]

But most important with regard to the history of civilisation was the Jewish Dispersion in Egypt and especially in Alexandria.[23] Long before the time of Alexander the Great

[19] The account of Clearchus is preserved by Josephus, *contra Apionem*, i. 22 (p. 200 sq., ed. Bekker). Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* ix. 5, has the history from Josephus. Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* i. 15. 70, also briefly notices the matter. Comp. Müller, *Fragmenta Hist. Graec.* ii. 323 sq. Gutschmid, *Neue Beiträge zur Geschichte des alten Orients* (1876), p. 77.

[20] *Antt.* xii. 3. 4.

[21] Philo, ed. Mang. ii. 587: ἄχρι Βιθυνίας καὶ τῶν τοῦ Πόντου μυχῶν. Comp. also Acts xviii. 2 (Aquila, a Jew of Pontus).

[22] See a Jewish inscription from Pantikapaion (on the Cimmerian Bosphorus) of the year 377 aer. Bosp. = A.D. 81, in the *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1005 (addenda, n. 2114[bb]). Another from Anapa (also in the Crimea) of the year 338 aer. Bosp. = A.D. 42 in Stephani, *Pererga archaeologica* (*Bulletin de l'Académie de St. Pétersbourg*, vol. i. 1860, col. 244 sqq.). See also Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. (1875) p. 269. The Hebrew inscriptions from the Crimea, some of which Chwolsen thought might be referred to even the first century after Christ (Chwolsen, *Achtzehn hebräische Grabschriften aus der Krim*, *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vii.e Série, vol. ix. 1866, No. 7), are much more modern, the dates which decide the question having been fabricated by Firkowitsch. See the proof in Strack (*A. Firkowitsch und seine Entdeckungen, ein Grabstein der hebräischen Grabschriften der Krim*, Leipzig 1876) and Harkavy (*Altjüdische Denkmäler aus der Krim*, *Mémoires de l'Académie impériale des sciences de St. Pétersbourg*, vii.e Série, vol. xxiv. 1876, No. 1). The fact of the forgery was subsequently acknowledged to at least a limited extent by Chwolsen himself (in his *Corpus Inscriptionum Hebraicarum*, Petersburg 1882). Comp. also Kautzsch in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1883, p. 319 sqq.

[23] Comp. Cless, *De coloniis Judaeorum in Aegyptum terrasque cum Aegypto*

Jewish immigrants were already found there. Psammetichus I. is said to have had Jewish mercenaries in his army in his war against the Ethiopians, 650 B.C.[24] In the time of Jeremiah a large train of Jewish emigrants went into Egypt, for fear of the Chaldees and in opposition to the will of the prophet (Jer. xlii., xliii.; for the occasion, see Jer. xli.). They settled in various parts of Egypt, in Migdol, Tahpanhes, Noph and Pathros (Jer. xliv.);[25] and though many of them embraced the religion of Egypt and many were extirpated by war, still a remnant was left. A forcible deportation of Jewish colonists to Egypt is said to have taken place in the time of the Persian supremacy.[26] Their most flourishing period however does not begin till the time of Alexander the Great. As early as the foundation of Alexandria, Jewish settlers were attracted

*conjunctas post Mosen deductis*, P. I., Stuttg. 1832. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* art. "Alexandrien." See other literature in Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften Alten Testaments*, § 430.

[24] Aristeae, *epist.* ed. M. Schmidt, in Merx' *Archiv für wissenschaftl. Erforschung des A. T.* vol. i. p. 255 (Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 104), enumerates the three following chief emigrations of Jews to Egypt, from Ptolemy I. backwards: Ἐκεῖνος γὰρ (*i.e.* Ptolemy Lagos) ἐπελθὼν τὰ κατὰ κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην ἅπαντα, συγχρώμενος ἡμερίᾳ μετ' ἀνδρείας, τοὺς μὲν μετῴκιζεν, οὓς δὲ ἠχμαλώτιζε, φόβῳ πανθ' ὑποχειρία ποιούμενος· ἐν ὅσῳ καὶ πρὸς δέκα μυριάδας ἐκ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων χώρας εἰς Αἴγυπτον μετήγαγεν· ἀφ' ὧν ὡσεὶ τρεῖς μυριάδας καθοπλίσας ἀνδρῶν ἐκλεκτῶν εἰς τὴν χώραν κατῴκισεν ἐν τοῖς Φρουρίοις· ἦδη μὲν καὶ πρότερον ἱκανῶν εἰσεληλυθότων σὺν τῷ Πέρσῃ, καὶ πρὸ τούτων ἑτέρων συμμαχιῶν ἐξαπεσταλμένων πρὸς τὸν τῶν Αἰθιόπων βασιλέα μάχεσθαι σὺν Ψαμμητίχῳ· ἀλλ' οὐ τοσοῦτοι τῷ πλήθει παρεγενήθησαν, ὅσους Πτολεμαῖος ὁ τοῦ Λάγου μετήγαγε. That Psammetichus had foreign mercenaries in his army is evidenced elsewhere also; see Cless, *De coloniis*, pp. 4–7, and Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vi. 1. 167 sq.

[25] מִגְדֹּל and תַּחְפַּנְחֵס (= Daphne) are situate in the neighbourhood of Pelusium, *i.e.* on the north-eastern boundary of Lower Egypt. נֹף or מֹף is Memphis on the southern extremity of the Delta. פַּתְרוֹס is Upper Egypt. See the commentaries and the articles on this matter in Gesenius' *Thesaurus* and Winer's *Realwörterb.*

[26] Aristeas speaks of such a one in two passages; see one in note 24, above; the other, ed. Schmidt, p. 260, Havercamp's *Josephus*, ii. 2. 107. Comp. also Cless, *De coloniis*, pp. 11–13.

to it by the bestowal upon them of the rights of citizenship.[27] Large numbers of Jews afterwards came to Egypt chiefly under Ptolemy I. Lagos, some as prisoners of war and some as voluntary immigrants. They were employed by Ptolemy as mercenaries, especially for garrisoning fortified places.[28] In Alexandria a special quarter apart from the rest of the city was, in the times of the Diadochoi, assigned to the Jews, "that they might lead a purer life by mingling less with foreigners."[29] This Jewish quarter lay on the harbourless coast, in the neighbourhood of the royal palace, and therefore in the north-eastern part of the town.[30] This severance was not afterwards strictly maintained. For according to Philo there were Jewish houses of prayer in all parts of the city,[31] and many Jews dwelt

[27] *Apion.* ii. 4. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2.

[28] Hecatæus in Joseph. *Apion.* i. 22 (Bekker, p. 203, lin. 31 sq.): οὐκ ὀλίγαι δὲ [μυριάδες] καὶ μετὰ τὸν Ἀλεξάνδρου θάνατον εἰς Αἴγυπτον καὶ Φοινίκην μετέστησαν διὰ τὴν ἐν Συρίᾳ στάσιν. Further particulars in the passage quoted note 24 from Aristeas, and Josephus, *Antt.* xii. 1.

[29] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7: (οἱ διάδοχοι) τόπον ἴδιον αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, ὅπως καθαρωτέραν ἔχοιεν τὴν δίαιταν, ἧττον ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν ἀλλοφύλων. Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: χωρὶς δὲ τῆς τῶν Ἀλεξανδρέων πόλεως ἀφώριστο μέγα μέρος τῷ ἔθνει τούτῳ. According to Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4, it might appear as though Alexander the Great had assigned this special quarter to the Jews. But, according to the evidently more accurate statement in *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7, this was first done by the Diadochoi. Comp. J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen den Apion* (1877), p. 239.

[30] Josephus, *c. Apion.* ii. 4, *init.* (cited from Apion): ἐλθόντες ἀπὸ Συρίας ᾤκησαν πρὸς ἀλίμενον θάλασσαν, γειτνιάσαντες ταῖς τῶν κυμάτων ἐκβολαῖς . . . . (Josephus himself also says): πρὸς τοῖς βασιλείοις ἦσαν ἱδρυμένοι. The great harbour of Alexandria, along which lay the greater part of the town, is bounded on the west by the island of Pharos and the mole connecting the island with the continent, on the east by the promontory of Lochias, which juts out from the mainland into the sea (see especially the plan in Kiepert, *Zur Topographie des alten Alexandria*, Berlin 1872; also M. Erdmann, *Zur Kunde der hellenistischen Städtegründungen*, *Strassburger Progr.* 1883, pp. 10–23). On the promontory of Lochias and in its neighbourhood lay the royal citadel, with the numerous buildings appertaining to it (Strabo, xvii. 1. 9, p. 794), which together made up a fifth of the town (Plinius, v. 10. 62; see in general Pauly's *Real-Enc.* i. 1. 739 sq.). Hence the Jewish quarter lay on the coast east of the promontory of Lochias.

[31] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 20, Mang. ii. 565.

scattered through all its quarters.[32] But even Philo says also, that of the five districts of the town, which were named after the first five letters of the alphabet, two were called "the Jewish," because they were chiefly inhabited by Jews.[33] The separation was however on the whole maintained, and we shall find the Jewish quarter still in the same place, viz. in the east of the town, in Philo's time.[34] According to an incidental notice in Josephus, the Jews dwelt chiefly in the "so-called Delta," *i.e.* in the fourth district of the town.[35] Philo estimates the entire number of the Jewish inhabitants of Egypt at about *a million* in his days.[36] The Jews of Alexandria and Egypt took, in conformity with their large numbers and importance, a prominent part in all the chief conflicts between the Jewish and the heathen world, in the great persecution under Caligula (see § 17*c*) and in the insurrections in the times of Nero, Vespasian[37]

[32] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 8, Mang. ii. 525. See the next note.

[33] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 8, Mang. ii. 525: Πέντε μοῖραι τῆς πόλεώς εἰσιν, ἐπώνυμοι τῶν πρώτων στοιχείων τῆς ἐγγραμμάτου φωνῆς· τούτων δύο Ἰουδαϊκαὶ λέγονται, διὰ τὸ πλείστους Ἰουδαίους ἐν ταύταις κατοικεῖν. Οἰκοῦσι δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἄλλαις οὐκ ὀλίγοι σποράδες. The division of Alexandria into five districts and their appellation after the first five letters of the alphabet is also testified elsewhere. See Pseudo-Callisthenes, i. 32 (ed. Meusel in Fleckeisen's *Jahrbb. für class. Philol. Supplemental*, vol. v.): Θεμελιώσας δὲ τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος τῆς πόλεως Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ χωρογραφήσας ἐπέγραψε γράμματα πέντε· α β γ δ ε. The second of these districts is mentioned in an inscription of the time of Antoninus Pius: Τιβέριος Ἰούλιος Ἀλέξανδρος . . . . . τῶν ἀγορανομηκότων ὁ ἐπὶ τῆς εὐθηνίας τοῦ Β γράμματος (see Lumbroso in the *Annali dell' Instituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1875, p. 15; Bursian's *Jahresbericht*, f. 1874–75, vol. ii. p. 305; Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 455).

[34] Josephus expressly says, *c. Apion.* ii. 4, that the Jews did not subsequently relinquish the place occupied by them (κατέσχονας μηδ' ὕστερον ἐκπεσεῖν).

[35] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 8: εἰς τὸ καλούμενον Δέλτα· συνῴκιστο γὰρ ἐκεῖ τὸ Ἰουδαϊκόν.

[36] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 6, Mang. ii. 523: οὐκ ἀποδέουσι μυριάδων ἑκατὸν οἱ τὴν Ἀλεξάνδρειαν καὶ τὴν χώραν Ἰουδαῖοι κατοικοῦντες ἀπὸ τοῦ πρὸς Λιβύην καταβαθμοῦ μέχοι τῶν ὁρίων Αἰθιοπίας.

[37] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7–8, vii. 10.

and Trajan (see § 21).[38] The very history of these conflicts is at the same time a proof of the continued importance of the Egyptian Jews in the Roman period also. But besides the Jews properly so called, there were also Samaritans dwelling in Egypt. Ptolemy I. Lagos, when he conquered Palestine, carried away with him many captives, not only from Judaea and Jerusalem, but also "from Samaria and Mount Gerizim," and settled them in Egypt.[39] In the time of Ptolemy VI. Philometor the Jews and Samaritans are said to have brought their dispute, as to whether Jerusalem or Gerizim was the true place of worship, before the tribunal of the king.[40] Hadrian in his letter to Servianus says of the Samaritans in Egypt as well as of the Jews and Christians dwelling there, that they were all of them "astrologers, haruspices and quacks."[41] In a work of one Bishop Eulogius we are told of a synod held by him against the Samaritans. If we are to understand, that he is Eulogius of Alexandria, elsewhere spoken of, the flourishing condition of the Samaritans in Egypt during the sixth century after Christ would be proved.[42]

The Jewish Dispersion penetrated from Egypt farther westward. It was very numerously represented in Cyrenaica.

[38] Comp. on the Alexandrian persecutions of the Jews, the Rabbinical passages cited by Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 99, *s.v.* אלכסנדריא.

[39] Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 1: *πολλοὺς αἰχμαλώτους λαβὼν ἀπό τε τῆς ὀρεινῆς Ἰουδαίας καὶ τῶν περὶ τὸ Ἱεροσόλυμα τόπων καὶ τῆς Σαμαρείτιδος καὶ τῶν ἐν τῷ ὄρει τῷ Γαριζείν, κατῴκισεν ἅπαντας εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἀγαγών.*

[40] *Antt.* xiii. 3. 4. Comp. xii. 1, *fin.*

[41] *Vopisc. vita Saturnini*, c. 8 (in the *Scriptores historiae Augustae*): nemo illic archisynagogus Judaeorum, nemo Samarites, nemo Christianorum presbyter non mathematicus, non haruspex, non aliptes.

[42] We know the work of this Eulogius only from the information given in Photius, *Biblioth. cod.* 230, *s. fin.* (ed. Bekker, p. 285). Photius esteemed the author to be Eulogius of Alexandria (at the end of the 6th century), which however is not consistent with the fact, that the synod is said to have been held in the seventh year of the Emperor Marcianus (450–457). The only alternative is either to alter Marcianus into Mauricius, who reigned from A.D. 582 to 602 (as *e.g.* Fabricius-Harles, *Biblioth. gr.* x. 754), or to think of some other Eulogius, perhaps the bishop of Philadelphia, in

Ptolemy I. Lagos had already sent Jewish settlers thither.[43] According to Strabo, the inhabitants of the city of Cyrene were in Sulla's time (about 85 B.C.) divided into four classes: 1. citizens, 2. agriculturists, 3. metoikoi, 4. Jews.[44] At that time the Jews were already playing a prominent part in the disturbances in Cyrene, which Lucullus had to allay during his accidental presence there.[45] The Jews at Cyrene seem to have been at all times quite specially disposed to insurrection. In the time of Vespasian the after-piece of the war was played out here,[46] and in the time of Trajan Cyrenaica was a main seat of the great Jewish revolt (see above, § 21).[47] We may also safely assume, that Jewish settlements likewise existed still farther westward. Only single traces of such are however to be discovered with any certainty.[48]

Palestine, who signed the acts of the Council of Chalcedon 451 (as *e.g.* Tillemont and Ceillier; see in general, Smith and Wace, *Dictionary of Christian Biography*, *s.v.* Eulogius). In the latter case his work would be taken no account of in the history of the *Egyptian* Samaritans.

[43] Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4. Comp. on the history of Cyrenaica, Thrige, *Res Cyrenensium*, Hafniae 1828. Clinton, *Fasti Hellenici*, iii. 394–398. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. (1881) pp. 457–464, and the literature there cited. On the geography, Forbiger, *Handb. der alten Geographie*, ii. 825–832.

[44] Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: *τέτταρες δ' ἦσαν ἐν τῇ πόλει τῶν Κυρηναίων, ἥ τε τῶν πολιτῶν καὶ ἡ τῶν γεωργῶν, τρίτη δ' ἡ τῶν μετοίκων καὶ τετάρτη ἡ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.*

[45] Strabo in Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2. On the doings of Lucullus in Cyrene, see Plutarch. *Lucull.* 2. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, i. 459. His main object was to requisition ships for Sulla. But he had also internal disturbances to compose, the condition of Cyrene, which was not organized as a province till 74 B.C., being still very disordered.

[46] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 11; *Vita*, 76.

[47] Comp. on the history of the Jews in Cyrene, 1 Macc. xv. 23 (also above, p. 221); *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1, 5; and the inscription of Berenike, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 5361. Jews of Cyrene are mentioned 2 Macc. ii. 23 (Jason of Cyrene), Matt. xxvii. 32=Mark xv. 21=Luke xxiii. 26 (Simon of Cyrene); Acts ii. 10 (Cyrenians at the feast of Pentecost at Jerusalem); Acts vi. 9 (synagogue of the Cyrenians in Jerusalem); Acts xi. 20 (Cyrenians come from Jerusalem to Antioch); Acts xiii. 1 (Lucius of Cyrene at Antioch).

[48] A Jewish inscription Pompejo Restuto Judeo at Citra, in Leon Renier,

The diffusion of the Jews in Greece is already evident from the history of the Apostle Paul, who found Jewish synagogues in Thessalonica, Beroea, Athens and Corinth (Acts xvii. 1, 10, 17, xviii. 4, 7). This is confirmed by the expressions of Agrippa in the above-mentioned epistle to Caligula.[49] There were also Jews in almost all the islands of the Grecian Archipelago and the Mediterranean Sea, and in some of these in large numbers. In the epistle Euböa, Cyprus and Crete are decidedly mentioned.[50] And if we only know this expressly in a smaller measure of the smaller islands, the reason lies in the scantiness of our sources of information.[51]

In *Italy* Rome was the seat of a Jewish community numbered by thousands.[52] The first appearance of Jews in

*Inscriptions de l'Algérie* (Paris 1855), n. 2072 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 7155. A pater sinagogae upon an inscription at Sitifis in Mauritania in Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* vol. iii. n. 6145 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 8499. That there were Jews in Carthage in Tertullian's time appears from the commencement of his work, *adv. Judaeos*. Freidländer, *De Judaeorum coloniis* (Königsberg *Progr.* 1876), refers to a passage of Procopius (*De aedif.* vi. 2, ed. Dindorf, iii. 334).

[49] Comp. also *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iv. n. 9900 (a Jewish inscription at Athens), n. 9896 (at Patras in Achaia).

[50] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 36, Mang. ii. 587. Comp. on Cyprus, Acts xiii. 4 sqq. Joseph. *Antt.* 10. 4, and the history of the great insurrection under Trajan (§ 21, above); on Crete, Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1; *Vita*, 76.

[51] Comp. 1 Macc. xv. 23 (on this see above, p. 221. Delos, Samos, Cos and Rhodes are named). *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9894 (a Jewish inscription at Algina); Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1 (Melos); *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8 (Paros); *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8 and 14 (Delos); *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2 and 10. 15 (Cos).

[52] Comp. on the Jews in Rome, Migliore, *Ad inscriptionem Flaviae Antoninae commentarius sive de antiquis Judaeis Italicis exercitatio epigraphica* (MS. of the Vatican library, n. 9143, cited by Engeström). Auer, *Die Juden in Rom unmittelbar vor und nach Christi Geburt* (*Zeitschr. für die gesammte kathol. Theol.* vol. iv. No. 1, 1852, pp. 56–105). Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.*, 2nd ed. iii. 383–392 (1st ed. iii. 71–81). Renan, *Paulus*, p. 131 sqq. Engeström, *Om Judarne i Rom under äldre tider och deras katakomber*, Upsala 1876. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, New York 1876. Schürer, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit*, Leipzig 1879. Hamburger, *Real-Enc. für Bibel und Talmud*, Div. ii.

Rome dates from the time of the Maccabees. Judas Maccabaeus sent an embassy to the Senate to conclude an alliance with Rome, or, to speak more correctly, to obtain an assurance of its friendship and assistance (1 Macc. viii. 17–32). His brother and successor Jonathan followed his example (1 Macc. xii. 1–4, xvi.). Of greater importance was the embassy, which Simon the third of the Maccabaean brothers sent to Rome in the year 140–139 B.C. It effected an actual offensive and defensive alliance with the Romans (1 Macc. xiv. 24, xv. 15–24). During their prolonged sojourn at Rome the envoys or their retinue seem also to have attempted a religious propaganda. For it is this that is alluded to in the certainly somewhat confused notice in Valerius Maximus, i. 3. 2: Idem (viz. the praetor Hispalus) Judaeos, qui Sabazi Jovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit).[53] Jupiter Zabazius is indeed a Phrygian deity.[54] Since however *Judaeos* is certified

pp. 1033–1037 (art. "Rom"). Hild, *Les juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la littérature* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1884, pp. 1–37, and continuation). Hudson, *History of the Jews in Rome*, 2nd ed. London 1884 (394 pp.). The works and articles of Levy, Garrucci and others on the inscriptions of the Jewish catacombs in Rome (see above, § 2).

[53] There is a large hiatus in the first book of the text of Valerius Maximus. Two extracts from his works, which have been preserved to us, that of Julius Paris and that of Januarius Nepotianus (both given by Mai, *Scriptorum veterum nova collectio*, iii. 3, 1828) help to fill it up. (For the hiatus, see also Kempt's edition of Valerius Maximus, 1854.) The passage with which we are concerned is given above, according to the extract of Paris. In the extract of Nepotianus this same passage runs as follows: Judaeos quoque, qui Romanis tradere sacra sua conati erant, idem Hippalus urbe exterminavit; arasque privatas e publicis locis abiecit. Since then both summarizers have the word *Judaeos*, it must without doubt have existed in Valerius Maximus. It is wanting only in the printed common text derived from a bad transcript from Paris, which I followed in the first edition of this book.

[54] Comp. on Sabazius, Georgii in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* vii. 1, 615–621. Lenormant in the *Revue archéologique*, new series, vol. xxviii. 1874, pp. 300 sqq., 380 sqq., xxix. 1875, p. 43 sqq. On his worship in Rome, Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, p. 80 sq.; *Corp. Inscr.*

by the text, his appellation in our passage undoubtedly rests upon a confusion of the Jewish *Sabaoth* (*Zebaoth*) with *Sabazius*.[55] The event here related happened however (according to the immediately preceding words in Valerius Maximus) during the consulate of Popilius Laenas and L. Calpurnius Piso (B.C. 139), *i.e.* exactly at the time of Simon's embassy, to which it is most probably to be referred. It may also be inferred from it, that no Jews then dwelt permanently in Rome. The settlement there of a great number of Jews dates only from the time of Pompey. After his conquest of Jerusalem in the year 63 B.C., he brought numerous Jewish prisoners of war with him to Rome. They were then sold as slaves; but many of them were soon set at liberty, their strict adherence to their Jewish customs being inconvenient to their masters. Endowed with the privileges of Roman citizenship, they settled beyond the Tiber and formed an independent Jewish community.[56] From that time onwards the Jewish

*Lat.* vol. vi. n. 429, 430. Cicero already knows of the Sabazia (*De natura deorum*, iii. 23. 58).

[55] Zebaoth is indeed not a proper name. The Hebrew Jahveh Zebaoth having however been rendered by κύριος Σαβαώθ (by the LXX. especially in Isaiah, see Trommius' *Concordance*, the form Σαβαώθ being better evidenced than Σαββαώθ), Σαβαώθ has in fact been treated as a name of God by Jews, Christians and heathen, see *Orac. Sibyll.* i. 304, 316, ii. 240, xii. 132 (ed. Friedlieb, x. 132). Celsus in Origen, *c. Cels.* i. 24, v. 41, 45. The Gnostics in Irenaeus, i. 30. 5; Origen, *c. Cels.* vi. 31, 32; Epiphanius, *haer.* xxvi. 10, xl. 2. Many Gnostics (see Baudissin, *Studien zur semitischen Religionsgeschichte*, No. 1, 1876, p. 187 sqq.); Origen himself, *Exhortatio ad martyrium*, c. 46; Hieronymus, *epist.* 25 *ad Marcellam de decem nominibus Dei* (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, i. 130). Also in similar anonymous treatises on the names of God (Hieronymi *Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, iii. 749 sq. Legarde, *Onomastica sacra*, pp. 160, 205 sq.). The Hebrew Sabbath is certainly out of the question, as it is not possible to see how that could be understood as the name of the Deity.

[56] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23, Mang. ii. 568: Πῶς οὖν ἀπεδέχετο (*scil.* Augustus) τὴν πέραν τοῦ Τιβέρεως ποταμοῦ μεγάλην τῆς Ῥώμης ἀποτομήν, ἣν οὐκ ἠγνόει κατεχομένην καὶ οἰκουμένην πρὸς Ἰουδαίων; Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλείους ἀπελευθερωθέντες. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀχθέντες εἰς Ἰταλίαν ὑπὸ τῶν κτησαμένων ἠλευθερώθησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων παραχαράξαι βιασθέντες.

colony in Trastevere formed no unimportant factor in Roman life. When Cicero, in the year 59 B.C., made his oration in defence of Flaccus, we find many Jews present among the auditors.[57] At the death of Caesar, the great protector of the Jews, a multitude of the latter made lamentation at his bier during whole nights.[58] In the time of Augustus they were already numbered by thousands. Josephus at least tells us that 8000 Roman Jews joined the deputation which came from Palestine to Rome in the year 4 B.C.[59] In the time of Tiberius repressive measures commenced. According to Josephus, the whole Jewish population was banished from Rome A.D. 19, because a few Jews had swindled a noble female proselyte named Fulvia of large sums of money under the pretext of sending them to the temple at Jerusalem.[60] Four thousand Jews capable of bearing arms were on this account deported to Sardinia to fight against the brigands in that island; the rest were banished from the city. Such are the accounts of Tacitus,[61] Suetonius,[62] and Josephus,[63] whose statements

[57] Cicero, *pro Flacco*, 28.

[58] Sueton. *Caesar*, 84: In summo publico luctu exterarum gentium multitudo circulatim suo quaeque more lamentata est, praecipueque Judaei, qui etiam noctibus continuis bustum frequentarunt.

[59] *Antt.* xvii. 11. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 6. 1.

[60] *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5.

[61] *Annal.* ii. 85: Actum et de sacris Aegyptiis Judaicisque pellendis factumque patrum consultum, ut quattuor milia libertini generis ea superstitione infecta, quis idonea aetas, in insulam Sardiniam veherentur, coercendis illic latrociniis et, si ob gravitatem caeli interissent, vile damnum; ceteri cederent Italia, nisi certam ante diem profanos ritus exuissent.

[62] *Vita Tiber.* 36: Externas caerimonias, Aegyptios Judaicosque ritus compescuit, coactis qui superstitione ea tenebantur religiosas vestes cum instrumento omni comburere. Judaeorum juventutem per speciem sacramenti in provincias gravioris caeli distribuit, reliquos gentis ejusdem vel similia sectantes urbe summovit, sub poena perpetuae servitutis nisi obtemperassent.

[63] Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 3. 5) says expressly, that 4000 Jews were chosen for military service and sent to Sardinia. Tacitus gives the same number, but speaks of Egyptians and Jews. According to Tacitus, the rest

essentially agree. According to the contemporary narrative of Philo, these measures were chiefly carried out by the then powerful Sejanus.[64] After his overthrow, A.D. 31, Tiberius perceived that the Jews had been slandered without cause by Sejanus, and commanded the authorities (*ὑπάρχοις*) in all places not to molest the Jews, nor to prevent the practice of their customs.[65] It may here be assumed that a return to Rome was also allowed them; and this explains the fact that Philo should, so early as the time of Caligula, again take for granted the existence of the Jewish community. The reign of Claudius began with a general Edict of Toleration in favour of the Jews.[66] But this emperor also subsequently found himself obliged to take measures against them. According to the short accounts in the Acts and Suetonius, an actual expulsion of the Jews took place under Claudius.[67] According however to the evidently more accurate account of Dio Cassius,

had been expelled from Italy; according to Josephus, only from Rome. Suetonius agrees more with Josephus. On the chronology, comp. Volkmar, *Die Religionsverfolgung unter Kaiser Tiberius und die Chronologie des Fl. Josephus in der Pilatus-Periode* (*Jahrbb. für prot. Theol.* 1885, pp. 136–143). Volkmar correctly concludes, that Josephus (*Antt.* xviii. 3. 5) means the same expulsion of Jews as Tacitus, and that it took place (according to the narrative of Tacitus) A.D. 19.

[64] Euseb. *Chron. ad ann. Abr.* 2050 (ed. Schoene, ii. 150), from the Armenian: Seianus Tiberii procurator, qui intimus erat consiliarius regis, universim gentem Judaeorum deperdendam exposcebat. Meminit autem huius Philon in secunda relatione. Syncellus, ed. Dindorf, i. 621: *Σηιανὸς ἔπαρχος Τιβερίου Καίσαρος περὶ τελείας ἀπωλείας τοῦ ἔθνους τῶν Ἰουδαίων πολλὰ οὖν ἐβούλευε τῷ Καίσαρι, ὡς Φίλων Ἰουδαῖος ἐξ Ἀλεξανδρείας διάγων ἱστορεῖ ἐν τῇ δευτέρᾳ τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ πρεσβείας.* Hieronymus, *Chron.* (in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene, ii. 151): Seianus praefectus Tiberii qui apud eum plurimum poterat instantissime cohortatur, ut gentem Judaeorum deleat. Filo meminit in libro legationis secundo. The same information, according to the same work of Philo, is also found in Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 5. 7. Comp. on this work of Philo, § 34, below.

[65] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 24, ed. Mang. ii. 569.

[66] Joseph. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2, 3.

[67] Acts xviii. 2: *διὰ τὸ διατεταχέναι Κλαύδιον χωρίζεσθαι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῆς Ῥώμης.* Sueton. *Claud.* 25: Judaeos impulsore Chresto assidue tumultuantes Roma expulit.

Claudius only prohibited the assemblies of the Jews, because their expulsion could not be carried out without great tumult.[68] This prohibition was indeed equal to a prohibition of the free exercise of their religion, and would certainly have the result of inducing many to leave the city. Its date cannot be accurately determined; it was probably promulgated in the later times of Claudius.[69] From the words of Suetonius it

[68] Dio Cass. lx. 6: *τούς τε Ἰουδαίους πλεονάσαντας αὖθις, ὥστε χαλεπῶς ἂν ἄνευ ταραχῆς ὑπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου σφῶν τῆς πόλεως εἰρχθῆναι, οὐκ ἐξήλασε μέν, τῷ δὲ δὴ πατρίῳ βίῳ χρωμένους ἐκέλευσε μὴ συναθροίζεσθαι.* In Dio Cassius this notice stands at the beginning of the reign of Claudius, while the measure related in the Acts of the Apostles probably took place much later (see note 69). Dio Cassius however is not here giving as yet a chronological narrative, but only describing the general characteristics of Claudius (this to me seems certain notwithstanding the remarks to the contrary of H. Lehmann, *Studien zur Gesch. des apost. Zeitalters*, pp. 2–4, with the words *λέξω δὲ καθ' ἕκαστον ὧν ἐποίησε*, c. 3. Dio passes over not to a chronological narrative, but to a description of the good side of Claudius). It is not credible that an unfavourable edict against the Jews should be carried into effect in the early days of Claudius, who was just then issuing an edict for their toleration. The edict therefore mentioned by Dio Cassius is most probably identical with that of Suetonius. For it would indeed be strange if one should mention the former and the other the latter. The *expulit* of Suetonius must be understood according to the analogy of Suetonius, *Tiber.* 36: expulit et mathematicos, sed deprecantibus . . . veniam dedit. The expulsion was indeed contemplated, but when it was perceived that it would encounter difficulties, it was abandoned. This also explains the silence of Tacitus and Josephus.

[69] The year might be accurately determined if this edict were identical with that mentioned by Tacitus of the year 52. Tac. *Annal.* xii. 52: De mathematicis Italia pellendis factum senatus consultum atrox et irritum. But the *mathematici* cannot possibly mean the Jewish community at Rome. In the Chronicle of Eusebius and Jerome the expulsion of the Jews by Claudius is not mentioned. Orosius alone, vii. 6. 15 (ed. Zangemeister, 1882), gives a precise date for this edict: Anno ejusdem nono expulsos per Claudium Urbe Judaeos Josephus refert. Since however Josephus makes no mention at all of the matter, the statement is certainly incorrect with respect to authority and therefore probably unreliable with respect to matter. It is moreover probable, from the connection of the Acts of the Apostles (observe the *προσφάτως*, Acts xviii. 2), that the edict was issued about A.D. 50–52. Comp. in general, Anger, *De temporum in actis apostolorum ratione* (1833), p. 116 sqq. Wieseler, *Chronologie des apostol. Zeitalters*, pp. 120–128. Winer, *RWB.* i. 231 sq. (art. "Claudius"). H.

might indeed be inferred, that it was occasioned by the disturbances, which arose within Judaism in consequence of the preaching of Christ.[70] This edict of Claudius had also but transient consequences. Such measures were not capable of extirpating the firmly rooted Jewish community, or of even permanently weakening it. It was already, chiefly by means of its numerous proselytes, too much intertwined with Roman life for its complete suppression to be successful. The Jews, when expelled from the city, emigrated to the neighbourhood, perhaps to Aricia,[71] soon to return thence to their old abodes. Their history in Rome may be summed up in the words of Dio Cassius: Often suppressed, they nevertheless mightily increased, so that they achieved even the free exercise of their customs.[72] The aristocratic Roman indeed looked down upon them with contempt. But the numerous lampoons of the satirists are just so many evidences of the notice they attracted in Roman society.[73] Even from the time of Augustus direct relations of Jews to the imperial court are not lacking; nay, in the reign of Nero the Empress Poppaea seems herself to have been inclined to Judaism.[74] By degrees they spread

Lehmann, *Studien zur Geschichte des apostolischen Zeitalters* (1856), pp. 1–9. Lewin, *Fasti Sacri* (London 1865), n. 1773, 1774. Keim, art. "Claudius," in Schenkel's *Bibellex.*

[70] On Chrestus = Cristus, see Hug, *Einl. in das N. T.* (4th ed.) ii. 335. Credner, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 381. Hilgenfeld, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 303 sq. Huidekoper, *Judaism at Rome*, p. 229 sq.

[71] This is intimated by the scholiast on Juvenal, iv. 117: qui ud portam Aricinam sive ad clivum mendicaret inter Judaeos, qui ad Ariciam transierant ex Urbe missi.

[72] Dio Cass. xxxvii. 17: ἔστι καὶ παρὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις τὸ γένος τοῦτο, κολουσθὲν μὲν πολλάκις, αὐξηθὲν δὲ ἐπὶ πλεῖστον, ὥστε καὶ ἐς παῤῥησίαν τῆς νομίσεως ἐκνικῆσαι.

[73] On the social position of the Jews in Rome, see the literature cited above, note 52, especially Hausrath, *Neutestamentl. Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. iii. 383–392.

[74] The names Αὐγουστήσιοι and Ἀγριππήσιοι, borne by two Jewish communities in Rome (see below, No. 2), point to the relations of Jews to Augustus and Agrippa. The Empress Livia had a Jewish female slave of

farther in the city also. The quarter in Trastevere was no longer their only one. We find them subsequently in the Campus Martius, and in the midst of the Roman commercial world in the Subura (see below, No. 2). Juvenal jests at the fact, that the sacred grove of Egeria, before the Porta Capeno, was leased to Jews and swarmed with Jewish beggars (*Sat.* iii. 12–16). The settlement of Jews in various quarters of the town, and their continued prosperity down to the later imperial

the name of Akme (Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 5. 7; *Bell. Jud.* i. 32. 6, 33. 7). Upon an inscription of the time of Claudius, a [Cl]audia Aster [Hi]erosolymitana [ca]ptiva, evidently a Jewish female slave of Claudius, is mentioned (Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 5302 = Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 6467 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1971). We find a Jewish comedian Alityrus at the court of Nero (Joseph. *Vita*, 3). Poppaea is herself designated as θεοσεβής, and was always ready to advocate Jewish petitions with the emperor (Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 8. 11; *Vita*, 3). Tacitus, *Annal.* xvi. 6, remarks of her, that after her death she was not burnt according to Roman custom, but embalmed "after the fashion of foreign kings." The Jewish historian Josephus lived in Rome under Vespasian, Titus, and Domitian honoured and assisted by the kindness of all three emperors (Joseph. *Vita*, 76). In the person of Domitian's cousin Flavius Clemens, not Judaism indeed, but Christianity, which proceeded from Judaism, penetrated even the imperial family (for so are Dio Cass. lxvii. 14, and Sueton. *Domit.* 15, now universally and correctly understood). Of later date may perhaps be mentioned also the Jewish playfellow (conlusor) of Caracalla (Spartian. *Caracalla*, 1; also Görres, *Zeitschr. f. Wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1884, p. 147 sqq.). We must remember too the active relations of Herod and his dynasty with Augustus and his successors. Most of Herod's sons were brought up at Rome. Agrippa I. spent the greater part of his life in Rome, remaining there till his nomination as king; as a boy he was on terms of friendship with Drusus, the son of Tiberius (Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 6. 1), and afterwards with Caligula. The intimate relations of Agrippa II. and Berenice with Vespasian and Titus are well known; and lastly, it is worthy of remark how frequently the Gentile names of emperors are found among Jewish names upon inscriptions. The following occur, and that in tolerably large numbers: Julius, Claudius, Flavius, Aelius, Aurelius, Valerius. Even though these names may frequently refer not to the old families, but to later emperors (Constantine the Great's full name *e.g.* being C. Flavius Valerius Aurelius Claudius Const.), still they certainly prove a close relation of the Jews to the emperors. Comp. also Harnack's article on the Christians at the imperial court (*Princeton Review*, July 1878, pp. 239–280).

times, are also especially evidenced by Jewish burying-grounds, some of them the discovery of recent times. Of these, the five following are now known:[75] (1) A somewhat insignificant cemetery before the Porta Portuensis, discovered by Bosio in the year 1602. This was certainly the burial-place of the Jews in Trastevere. The knowledge of the locality was afterwards lost, and all efforts for its re-discovery have hitherto been unsuccessful.[76] (2) A large cemetery, discovered in the beginning of the sixth decade of this century, on the Via Appia in the Vigna Randanini (somewhat farther out than the catacomb of Callistus). To it we owe our acquaintance with a large number of Romano-Jewish inscriptions.[77] (3) In the year 1867 (or 1866) a Jewish cemetery, of which de Rossi gives a short account, was discovered in the vineyard of Count Cimarra, also on the Via Appia, nearly opposite the catacomb of Callistus.[78] (4) A Jewish cemetery on the Via Labicana, therefore in the neighbourhood of the Esquinal and Viminal, of perhaps the date of the Antonines, was pointed out by Marucchi in the year 1883.[78a] (5) There was also in Porto (at the mouth of the Tiber) a Jewish cemetery, from which are derived many of the Jewish epitaphs with which we have for a long time been acquainted.[79] The antiquity of this cemetery, and of the inscriptions contained in it, can only be

[75] Comp. the summary in Kraus, *Roma Sotterranea* (1st. ed. 1873), p. 489 sq.; and in Caspari, *Quellen zur Gesch. des Taufsymbols*, iii. 1875, p. 271 sq.

[76] Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 3.

[77] Comp. Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei scoperto recentemente in Vigna Randanini*, Rome 1862. The same, *Dissertazioni archeologiche di vario argomento*, vol. ii. Roma 1865, pp. 150–192. On the situation of the cemetery, see the plan in De Rossi, *Bullettino di Archeologia cristiana* (1st series), vol. v. 1867, p. 3, and the explanation, p. 16.

[78] De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 16.

[78a] Marucchi in de Rossi's *Bullettino*, 1883, p. 79 sq.

[79] See de Rossi, *Bullettino*, iv. 1866, p. 40. The inscriptions known down to the year 1850 are collected in *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iv. n. 9901 9926. Comp. the literature on the inscriptions, § 2, above.

approximately determined. They may date chiefly from the second to the fourth centuries after Christ.

Besides Jews properly so called, there were in Rome (as in Alexandria) Samaritans also. A Samaritan of the name of Thallus, a freedman of the Emperor Tiberius, once lent a large sum to Agrippa I. in Rome.[80] The existence of a Samaritan community in Rome, in the time of the Ostrogoth king Theodoric, is evidenced by a letter of this king to the knight Arigernus, which is embodied in the collection of letters of Cassiodorus.[81] That the Samaritans were by no means without importance in the Roman Empire in later imperial times, is shown by the frequent reference to them in imperial legislation.[82]

After the Jewish community in Rome, that of Puteoli (Dikäarchia) is presumably the most ancient in Italy. In this chief trading port of Italy with the East, we find Jews so early as B.C. 4, immediately after the death of Herod the Great.[83] Their presence cannot be pointed out in other parts of Italy till later imperial times; this does not however permit any negative inference as to the date of their settlement.[84] Much material in the way of inscriptions has recently

[80] Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 6. 4.

[81] Cassiodor. *Variarum*, iii. 45 (*Opp.* ed. Garetius): Arigerno Viro Illustri Comiti Theodoricus Rex . . . . Defensores itaque sacrosanctae Romanae ecclesiae conquesti sunt, beatae recordationis quondam Simplicium domum in sacratissima Urbe positam ab Eufrasio Acolyto instrumentis factis solemniter comparasse; quam per annorum longa curricula ecclesiam Romanam quieto jure suggerunt possedisse et in usus alienos transtulisse securitate dominii. Nunc autem existere Samareae superstitionis populum improba fronte duratum, qui Synagogam ibidem fuisse iniquis conatibus mentiatur.

[82] *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel), xiii. 5. 18, xvi. 8. 16, u. 28. *Novell. Justin.* 129, u. 144.

[83] Joseph. *Antt.* xvii. 12. 1; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 7. 1. There was also a Christian church here so early as A.D. 61 (Acts xxviii. 13, 14).

[84] See the information in Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, vol. iii. (1871) pp. 511, 512. The same, *De Judaeorum*

been furnished especially by the discovery of the catacomb of *Venosa* (Venusia in Apulia, the birthplace of Horace). Its inscriptions in Greek, Latin and Hebrew are, according to Mommsen's judgment, of the sixth century after Christ.[85] We likewise meet with Jewish communities in various parts of Gaul and Spain in later imperial times. In respect of dates, what has been said with regard to Italy holds good here also.[68]

*colouiis* (Königsberg *Progr.* 1876), pp. 1, 2. Renan, *L'Antichrist* (1873), p. 8. For Lower Italy, also Ascoli, *Iscrizioni* (1880), pp. 33–38. The places in which they are found are especially the following: Genoa (Cassiodor. *Variar.* ii. 27), Milan (Cassiodor. *Variar.* v. 37), Brescia (inscription, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. v. n. 4411), Aquileia (Roman inscription in Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 62), Bologna (Ambrosius, *Exhortatio virginitatis*, c. 1), Ravenna (*Anonymus Valesii*, cc. 81–82, in the appendix to most editions of Ammianus Marcellinus), Capua (inscription in Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905), Naples (*Procop. Bell. Goth.* i. 8 and 10, ed. Dindorf, vol. ii. pp. 44 and 53), Venosa (see next note), Syracuse (inscription, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9895), Palermo, Messina, Agrigentum (*Letters of Gregory the Great*). In Apulia and Calabria the official posts of the different communities could not be regularly filled up, because the Jewish inhabitants refused to undertake them (edict of the Emperors Honorius and Arcadius of the year 398 in the *Codex Theodosianus*, xii. 1. 158: Vacillare per Apuliam Calabriamque plurimos ordines civitatum comperimus, quia Judaicae superstitionis sunt, et quadam se lege, quae in Orientis partibus lata est, necessitate subeundorum munerum aestimant defendendos).

[85] The catacomb was discovered as early as 1853, and described in two memoirs (by De Angelis and Smith and by D'Aloe). The MSS. of both memoirs however lay buried in the archives of the museum at Naples, till their contents were recently made known (1) in Ascoli's *Iscrizioni inedite o mal note greche latine ebraiche di antichi sepolchri giudaici del Napolitano*, Torino e Roma, 1880, and (2) in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. (1883), n. 6195–6214, comp. 647, 648. Hirschfeld had already given a short notice on the catacomb (*Bullettino dell' Instituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1867, pp. 148–152). Comp. also *Theol. Literaturztg.* 1880, pp. 485–488. Grätz, *Monatsschr.* 1880, p. 433 sqq. Lenormant, *La catacombe juive de Venosa* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, 1883, pp. 200–207). Besides the inscriptions in the catacomb, dated Hebrew epitaphs of Venosa of the ninth century are also known. See Ascoli's above-named work; *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 485.

[86] See the information in Friedländer's above-named work. With respect to Spain, we mention only the inscription *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ii. n 1982.

## II. CONSTITUTION OF THE JEWISH COMMUNITIES.

### 1. *Their Internal Organization.*[86a]

There was of course but one way by which those of the Jewish people that were scattered over the whole earth could possibly maintain their native religion and usages, and that was by organizing themselves into *independent communities*, within which they might cherish the faith and practise the observances of their fathers in a foreign land and in the heart of the Gentile world, just as though they were living in the Holy Land itself. And that this is what, as a rule, they were in the habit of doing, and that from an early period, at all events from the commencement of the Hellenistic era, it is impossible to doubt. The nature of the organization may have varied according to time and place, and above all in so far as those communities had sometimes the character of purely private associations, while at others they were to a greater or less extent in the enjoyment of political privileges; but, be this as it may, it is certain that wherever any considerable number of Jews happened to be living together, there an independent organization was always to be met with as well.

It is with regard to the *eastern diaspora* that our information on this point is most scanty; nay, so far as the diaspora dwelling in the countries bordering on the Euphrates is concerned we have none at all, at least none dating farther back than Talmudic times. Nor are matters much better as regards Asia Minor and Syria. The most noteworthy item of information that can be gleaned in connection with these latter is

[86a] For this comp. Rhenferd, *De arabarcha vel ethnarcha Judaeorum* (Rhenferdii *opera philologica*, 1722, pp. 581–613; also in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxiv.). Wesseling, *Diatribe de Judaeorum archontibus ad inscriptionem Berenicensem*, Traj. ad Rhen. 1738 (also in Ugolini's *Thes.* vol. xxiv.). Wesseling's dissertation continues to be of value even in the present day.

the incidental reference on one occasion to an *ἄρχων τῶν Ἰουδαίων* in Antioch.[87]

In Alexandria, where the Jews formed a large portion of the entire population, their community enjoyed very extensive political privileges. According to Strabo, they were presided over by an *ἐθνάρχης*, "who governs the people and administers justice among them, and sees that they fulfil their obligations and obey orders just like the archon of an independent city."[88] Consequently, although the Jews who lived here enjoyed the rights of citizenship (see No. III. below), they nevertheless formed an independent municipal community within or co-ordinate with the rest of the city, precisely as in the case of Cyrene. This independent position they also succeeded in maintaining in imperial times, and that very much owing to the circumstance that Alexandria, unlike almost all other Hellenistic towns, had no civic council.[89] The constitution of the Jewish community in Alexandria would seem to have undergone a certain change in the time of Augustus. At least Philo informs us that, *after the death* of the *γενάρχης*, Augustus instituted a *γερουσία, to which the direction of Jewish affairs was entrusted.*[90] No doubt this

[87] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3. Seeing that *ἄρχων* is without the article, it should be rendered not "the *ἄρχων*," but "an *ἄρχων*," *i.e.* one of the Jewish authorities.

[88] Strabo as quoted by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: *καθίσταται δὲ καὶ ἐθνάρχης αὐτῶν, ὃς διοικεῖ τε τὸ ἔθνος καὶ διαιτᾷ κρίσεις καὶ συμβολαίων ἐπιμελεῖται καὶ προσταγμάτων, ὡς ἂν πολιτείας ἄρχων αὐτοτελοῦς.*

[89] Spartian. Severus, chap. xvii. (in the *Scriptores Historiae Augustae*, ed. Peter, 1865). Dio Cass. li. 17. On the constitution of Alexandria generally, comp. Strabo, xvii. p. 797. Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 476 sqq. Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 451 sqq. Lumbroso, *Recherches sur l'économie politique de l'Egypte sous les Lagides* (Turin 1870), p. 212 sqq.

[90] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 527 sq.: *τῆς ἡμετέρας γερουσίας, ἣν ὁ σωτὴρ καὶ εὐεργέτης Σεβαστὸς ἐπιμελησομένην τῶν Ἰουδαϊκῶν εἵλετο μετὰ τὴν τοῦ γενάρχου τελευτὴν διὰ τῶν πρὸς Μάγνου Μάξιμον ἐντολῶν, μέλλοντα πάλιν ἐπ' Αἰγύπτου καὶ τῆς χώρας ἐπιτροπεύειν*

appears to be at variance with the fact that in an edict of Claudius it is stated, that after the death of the ἐθνάρχης Augustus did not forbid the further appointment of ethnarchs.[91] But probably this latter is only a repetition in a less accurate form of the fact mentioned by Philo, all that Claudius meant to say being simply this, that the Jews also continued as before to be governed by their own rulers (ἐθνάρχαι). The more accurate version of the matter is that of Philo, who states that ever since the time of Augustus the *single* ἐθνάρχης had been superseded by a γερουσία, over which a certain number of ἄρχοντες presided. Both the γερουσία and the ἄρχοντες are frequently mentioned by this writer.[92] These latter are identical with the πρωτεύοντες τῆς γερουσίας that occur in Josephus.[93] As bearing on the question of the number of members composing the γερουσία, we may mention the fact that on one occasion Flaccus caused thirty-eight of them to be dragged into the theatre and there scourged.[94] It is a very common error to identify the Jewish ethnarch with the Egyptian alabarch. The office of this latter was of a purely civil character, but of course it was often held by distinguished Jews (see No. III. below).

That the Jews living in Cyrene in like manner formed a separate political community is evident from the notice of Strabo already referred to, from which we learn that the inhabitants of this town were divided into four classes: (1) citizens; (2) tillers of the ground; (3) settlers; and (4) Jews.[95]

[91] Joseph. *Antt.* xix. 5. 2: τελευτήσαντος τοῦ Ἰουδαίων ἐθνάρχου τὸν Σεβαστὸν μὴ κεκωλυκέναι ἐθνάρχας γίνεσθαι.

[92] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 528: τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς γερουσίας τρεῖς ἄνδρες. *Ibid.*: μεταπεμψαμένῳ πρότερον τοὺς ἡμετέρους ἄρχοντας. *Ibid.* p. 528 sq.: τοὺς ἄρχοντας, τὴν γερουσίαν. *Ibid.* § 14, p. 534: τῶν μὲν ἀρχόντων.

[93] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 1.

[94] Philo, *In Flaccum*, § 10, Mang. ii. 527 sq.

[95] Strabo as quoted by Josephus, *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2.

But notwithstanding this separate existence the Jews enjoyed equality of civic rights (*ἰσονομία*).[96]

A very important light is thrown upon the constitution of the Jewish communities of the diaspora by a Jewish inscription found in Berenice, a town in Cyrenaica, and, according to Böckh's calculation, dating from the year 13 B.C.[97] From that inscription we find that the Jews of Berenice formed a distinct *πολίτευμα* by themselves (lin. 17 f., 21 f.) with *nine* (and these of course Jewish) *archons* at its head (lin. 2–8, 21–25).

[96] Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1: *τῶν μὲν πρότερον βασιλέων ἰσονομίαν αὐτοῖς παρεσχημένων.* Comp. Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, i. 463.

[97] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. iii. No. 5361:

[Ἔ]τους νε Φαῶφ κε, ἐπὶ συλλόγου τῆς σκηνο-
πηγίας, ἐπὶ ἀρχόντων Κλεάνδρου τοῦ
Στρατονίκου, Εὐφράνορος τοῦ Ἀρίστωνος,
Σωσιγένους τοῦ Σωσίππου, Ἀνδρομάχου
τοῦ Ἀνδρομάχου, Μάρκου Λαιλίου Ὀνασί-
ωνος τοῦ Ἀπολλωνίου, Φιλωνίδου τοῦ Ἀγή-
μονος, Αὐτοκλέους τοῦ Ζήνωνος, Σωνί-
κου τοῦ Θεοδότου, Ἰωσήπου τοῦ Στράτωνος·

Ἐπεὶ Μάρκος Τίττιος Σέξτου υἱὸς Αἰμιλία,
ἀνὴρ καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, παραγ[ε]νηθεὶς εἰς
τὴν ἐπαρχείαν ἐπὶ δημοσίων πραγμάτων τήν
τε προστασίαν αὐτῶν ἐποιήσατο φιλανθρώ-
πως καὶ καλῶς ἔν τε τῇ ἀναστροφῇ ἡσύχιον
ἦθος ἐνδ[ε]ικνύμενος ἀεὶ διατελῶν τυγχάνει,
οὐ μόνον δὲ ἐν τούτοις ἀβαρῆ ἑαυτὸν παρέσ-
χηται, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς κατ' ἰδίαν ἐντυγχάνουσι
τῶν πολιτῶν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἐκ τοῦ πολιτεύ-
ματος ἡμῶν Ἰουδαίοις καὶ κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν
εὔχρηστον προστασίαν ποιούμενος οὐ δια-
λείπει τῆς ἰδίας καλοκἀγαθίας ἄξια πράσσων
ὧν χάριν ἔδοξε τοῖς ἄρχουσι καὶ τῷ πολιτεύ-
ματι τῶν ἐν Βερενίκῃ Ἰουδαίων ἐπαινέσαι τε αὐ-
τὸν καὶ στεφανοῦν ὀνομαστὶ καθ' ἑκάστην
σύνοδον καὶ νουμηνίαν στεφάνῳ ἐλαΐνῳ καὶ
λημνίσκῳ· τοὺς δὲ ἄρχοντας ἀναγράψαι τὸ
ψήφισμα εἰς στήλην λίθου Παρίου καὶ θεῖναι εἰς
τὸν ἐπισημότατον τόπον τοῦ ἀμφιθεάτρου.

Λευκαὶ πᾶσαι.

But it is with regard to the constitution of the Jewish communities of Rome and of Italy generally that we are most thoroughly informed, and that owing to the great amount of light thrown on the subject by the large number of Jewish epitaphs that have been found in the cemeteries of Rome and Venosa.[98] These further show us, among other things, that here the same arrangements continued to subsist for centuries running without any material alteration. For the inscriptions of Venosa, dating from the sixth century after Christ, still present us with substantially the same picture as those of Rome, the oldest of which probably belong to one of the earliest centuries of our era. From the Roman inscriptions we gather, in the first place, that the Jews living in Rome were divided into *a large number of separate and independently organized communities* (*συναγωγαί*), each having its own synagogue, gerousia, and public officials. Of the existence of anything in the shape of a corporate union of the whole Jews of Rome under *one* *γερουσία* there is no trace whatever. While therefore the Jews of Alexandria formed a great political corporation, those of Rome had to be contented with the more modest position of separate religious societies. Those various communities called themselves by special names, of which the following are mentioned on the inscriptions: (1) a *συναγωγὴ Αὐγουστησίων*;[99] (2) a *συναγωγὴ Ἀγριππησίων*;[100] (3) a *synagoga Bolumni* (l. *Volumni*).[101] These three took their

[98] For what follows, comp. Schürer, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom in der Kaiserzeit nach den Inschriften dargestellt*, Leipzig 1879. The texts of the majority of the inscriptions to which reference is made are also reproduced in an appendix to this work.

[99] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo del Museo Nazionale di Napoli, Inscrizioni Latine*, n. 1956: *γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγοστησίων* (*sic*). *Corp. Inscr. Gr.* 9903 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, n. 1960: *ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Αὐγουστησίων*. Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 3222: *Marcus Cuyntus Alexus grammateus ego* (l. *ἐκ*) *tou Augustasion mellarcon eccion* (l. *ἐκ τῶν*) *Augustesion*.

[100] *Corp. Iscr. Graec.* 9907.

[101] Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 2522: *mater synagogarum Campi et Bolumni*.

names from certain distinguished personages. And seeing that along with *Αὐγουστήσιοι* we also meet with *Ἀγριππήσιοι*, there can hardly be a doubt that the former derived their name from the first Augustus, while the latter derived theirs from his friend and adviser M. Agrippa. The designation may be accounted for either by the fact that Augustus and Agrippa were patrons, the one of the one community and the other of the other, or from the circumstance that those communities were for the most part composed of slaves and freedmen of Augustus on the one hand, or of Agrippa on the other (comp. *οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας*, Phil. iv. 22). Other communities again took their names from the particular quarter of the city in which their members happened to reside, as, for example, (4) the *Καμπήσιοι* from the *Campus Martius*,[102] and (5) the *Σιβουρήσιοι* from the *Subura*, one of the busiest quarters of ancient Rome, and a centre of trade and industry.[103] Besides these we also hear (6) of a *συναγωγὴ Ἑβρέων*, probably that of such of the Jews as spoke Hebrew, in contradistinction to those of them who had ceased to speak it,[104] and (7) a *συναγωγὴ Ἐλαίας*, so called from the symbol of the olive.[105] Of the *officials* who are mentioned on those inscriptions we would notice above all the *γερουσιάρχης* and the *ἄρχοντες*. (1) A *γερουσιάρχης* occurs not only upon the

[102] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9905, 9906 (for more accurate texts according to Garrucci, see my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden*, Appendix, Nos. 4 and 5). Orelli, 2522. Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 161, n. 10.

[103] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 6447 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, n. 1954: Νειχοδημος ὁ ἀρχων Σιβουρησιων. On the *Subura*, see Pauly's *Real-Enc. der class. Alterthumswissensch.* vi. 1. 526. At the commencement of the imperial age it was of course forbidden to celebrate any foreign *sacra* in Rome proper, *i.e.* within the *pomaerium* (see Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, p. 35). But from the second century it was no longer so. Since then it was quite permissible to have Jewish synagogues also within the *pomaerium*.

[104] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9909.

[105] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904. De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 1867, p. 16. For the name, comp. also § 27, p. 74.

Roman inscriptions,[106] but likewise on those at Venosa[107] and elsewhere.[108] This title cannot have been intended to refer to any other than the president or head of the *γερουσία*. But from the designation *γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγουστησίων* it is evident, as has been already pointed out above, that each of the Roman communities had its own *γερουσία*, with its own officials. In view of this fact it is highly instructive to find, that upon the Roman inscriptions we nowhere meet with the title *πρεσβύτερος* (or any other like it, by which to denote the member of the *γερουσία* as such; for the *ἄρχοντες* were certainly not ordinary members, but the committee of the *γερουσία*). This fact can only be accounted for from the circumstance that it is only the *offices* properly so called that are mentioned by name upon the epitaphs, whereas the "elders" were not looked upon as officials in the technical sense of the word. They were the representatives and advisers of their community, but not officials with specific functions entrusted to them. (2) The title *ἄρχων* is of very frequent occurrence in the Roman inscriptions.[109] We have already met with it elsewhere, viz. in Antioch, Alexandria, and Berenice. It also occurs sometimes upon epitaphs found outside of Rome,[110] and

[106] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 9902 = Fiorelli, *Catal.* n. 1956: *Κυντιανὸς γερουσιάρχης συναγωγῆς Αὐγοστησίων.* Garrucci, *Cimitero degli antichi Ebrei*, p. 51: *Ἀστερίῳ γιερουσάρχῃ* (*sic*). *Ibid.* p. 62: *Οὐρσακίου ἀπὸ Ἀκουιλείας γερουσιάρχου.* *Ibid.* p. 96: *Παγχάρις γερουσιάρχης.* Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 183, n. 27: *Θαιόφιλ*[*ος γερο*]*υσιάρχης.*

[107] Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 55, n. 10 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. 6213 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, p. 204: *Φαυστινος γερουσιάρχου ἀρχίατρος.* Ascoli, p. 58, n. 15 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6221: *filius Viti ierusiarcontis.* Observe in both instances the form *γερουσιάρχων*, whereas on the Roman inscriptions it is always *γερουσιάρχης* that is used.

[108] Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 2555 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1893 (at Murano, near Naples): Ti. Claudius Philippus dia viu et gerusiarches.

[109] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* nn. 9906, 6447, 6337. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, pp. 35, 51, 61, 67. *Ibid. Dissertazioni*, ii. 158, n. 4, 164, 15, 16, 17, 18. De Rossi, *Bullettino*, v. 16. For more on this point, see my work, *Die Gemeindeverfassung der Juden in Rom.* p. 20 ff.

[110] De Rossi, *Bullettino*, iv. 40: *Κλαύδιος Ἰωσῆς ἄρχων* (at Porto, near

we may add that Tertullian classes the priest, Levite, and *archon* together as Jewish officials.[111] According to all analogy elsewhere (comp. especially Alexandria and Berenice) it may be taken for granted, in the case of the Roman communities as well, that *each of them* would have several ἄρχοντες, who would act as the managing committee of the γερουσία. It would appear from the title δὶς ἄρχων, which is repeatedly met with, that the archons were appointed for a definite period;[112] and in a *Homilia in S. Johannis Natalem*, ascribed to Chrysostom, and which has specially in view the state of matters in Italy during the imperial times, we are expressly informed that the archons *were always elected in September, the beginning of the civil year of the Jews.* The following are the *ipsissima verba* of this interesting passage:[113] Inter haec intuendae sunt temporum qualitates et gesta morum; et primum perfidia Judaeorum, qui semper in Deum et in Mosem contumaces exstiterunt, qui cum a Deo secundum Mosem initium anni mensem Martium acceperint, illi dictum pravitatis sive superbiae exercentes mensem Septembrem, ipsum novum annum nuncupant, quo et mense magistratus sibi designant, quos Archontas vocant. But besides the appointments for a definite period, there seem also to have been cases in which the appointment was for life. At least it is probable that the enigmatical title διὰ βίου, which is repeatedly met with, is

Rome). Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* n. 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905: Alfius Juda arcon arcosynagogus (at Capua).

[111] Tertullian, *De corona*, chap. ix.: Quis denique patriarches, quis prophetes, quis levites aut sacerdos aut archon, quis vel postea apostolus aut evangelizator aut episcopus invenitur coronatus?

[112] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9910 (for a facsimile of which see Engeström, *Om Judarne i Rom*, 1876, as a supplement): Σαββάτις δὶς ἄρχων. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 47: Μάρων β' ἄρχ(ων).

[113] This homily (according to Wesseling, *De Judaeorum archontibus*, chap. x.) is to be found in Chrysostomi *Opp.* vol. ii. ed. Paris 1687. As I have no means of consulting this edition, I quote the passage as given by Wesseling.

to be understood as referring to archons who were elected for life.[114]

As in Palestine so also in Rome and Italy, and in fact through the diaspora generally, we meet with the office of the *ἀρχισυνάγωγος*.[115] We have already (§ 27, p. 64) said all that is necessary to say regarding the difference between this office and that of the *γερουσιάρχης* and the *ἄρχοντες*. The archisynagogus is not simply the president of the community, but he is entrusted with the special task of conducting and supervising the meetings for religious purposes. Of course he may have been chosen from among the *ἄρχοντες*, so that the same person might thus be an archon

[114] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9903 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, 1960: Δατίβου τοῦ ζὼ (= διὰ) βίου ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Αὐγουστησίων. *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9907: Ζώσιμος διὰ βίου συναγωγῆς Ἀγριππησίων. Garrucci, *Dissertazioni* ii. 184, n. 29: Αιλια Πατρικια Τουλλιο Ειρηναιο κονιουγι βενεμερεντι φηκιτ διαβιο. Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 2555 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 1893: Ti Claudius Philippus dia viu et gerusiarches. Mommsen, *IRN.* 7190 = Fiorelli, *Catalogo*, 1962: Tettius Rufinus Melitius vicxit annis LXXXV. iabius. Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 51, n. 2 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6208: Ταφος Ανα διαβιου. Ascoli has advanced certain objections to the above-mentioned explanation at p. 112 of his *Inscrizioni*. Certainly in the case of *some* of those inscriptions (where the expression διὰ βίου comes in at the end) the correctness of this explanation may be questioned. In any case the inscription: εὐτιχῖτε, ὁ γάμος διὰ βίου, discovered by Clermont-Ganneau in Emmaus = Nicopolis in Palestine, is *not* pertinent to the matter now in hand (*Archives des missions scientifiques*, 3rd series, vol. ix. 1882, pp. 307–310; also in *The Survey of Western Palestine, Memoirs*, iii. 81). This seems to have been merely the expression of some one's good wishes on the occasion of a marriage: "May the union last διὰ βίου."

[115] In Rome, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9906: Ἰουλιανοῦ ἀρχισυναγώγου. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 67: Stafulo arconti et archisynagogo. In Capua, Mommsen, *Inscr. Regni Neap.* 3657 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n. 3905: Alfius Juda arcon arcosynagogus. In Venosa, Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 49, not. 1 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6201: Ταφος Καλλιστου νιπιου ἀρχοσσιναγωγου (*sic*). Ascoli, p. 52, n. 4 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6232 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. n. 12, p. 203: Ταφως Ασηλονα ἀρχοσηνωγουγου. Ascoli, p. 57, n. 12 = CIL, vol. ix. n. 6205 = Lenormant, p. 204: Ταφως Ἰοσηφ ἀρχησυναγωγως νίως Ἰωσηφ ἀρχησυναγογου. For the rest of the material, see § 27, p. 63.

and an archisynagogus at one and the same time. But as the inscriptions plainly show, the two offices were in themselves quite distinct. On the later use of the title ἀρχισυνάγωγος by women and children, and that merely as a title and nothing more, see above, p. 65. Besides the archisynagogus there was also another who had certain functions to discharge in connection with the meetings for public worship, and that was the synagogue officer (ὑπηρέτης), an official who is also once mentioned upon a Roman inscription.[116] Lastly, the titles *pater synagogae* and *mater synagogae* are pretty often met with on the inscriptions.[117] The circumstance of the title occurring also in this last-mentioned form should of itself render it probable that it was not intended to denote by it an office in the proper sense of the word, but simply an honourable position in the community. It was one that was applied, above all, to aged members, and to such of them as the community was indebted to for some good service or other.[118]

### 2. *Their Political Position.*

The Jewish communities are by no means a unique phenomenon within the circle of the Graeco-Roman world. In the Hellenistic period all the larger seaports of the Mediterranean

[116] Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 166, n. 22: Φλάβιος Ἰουλιανὸς ὑπηρέτης.

[117] πατὴρ συναγωγῆς, *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904, 9905, 9908, 9909. Garrucci, *Cimitero*, p. 52. *Ibid. Dissertazioni*, ii. 161, n. 10. *Pater sinagogae*, Orelli-Henzen, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 6145 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. viii. n. 8199. *Codex Theodosianus* (ed. Haenel), xvi. 8. 4: Hiereos et archisynagogos et patres synagogarum et ceteros, qui synagogis deserviunt. *Pater* (without anything more), Garrucci, *Dissertazioni*, ii. 164, n. 18. Ascoli, p. 58, n. 15 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 6221. Ascoli, p. 61, n. 19 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 648 and 6220 = Lenormant, p. 205 sq. *Mater synagogae*, *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. v. n. 4411. Orelli, 2522.

[118] Comp. the ages given in *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9904: Παγχάριος πατὴρ συναγωγῆς Ἐλαίας ἐτῶν ἑκατὸν (*sic*) δέκα. Orelli 2522, Beturia Paulini . . . quae bixit an. LXXXVI. meses VI. . . . mater synagogarum Campi et Bolumni.

came to be closely connected with each other in consequence of the brisk trade that was carried on between them, the result of which was that not only Jews, but also Phoenicians, Syrians, Egyptians and inhabitants of Asia Minor settled in larger or smaller numbers in many of the principal towns of Greece and Italy. All the settlers belonging to the same nation were naturally led by a community of temporal and spiritual interests, above all by their common worship, to band themselves together for mutual help, and consequently to unite themselves under a common organization. Wherever a considerable number of them happened to be living together, there they formed themselves into a separate society, and that principally for the purpose of maintaining their native worship in their midst. Consequently, just as there were diaspora communities composed of Jews, so in like manner there were those composed of Phoenicians, Egyptians, and so on. As early as the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree granting permission to the merchants from Citium (ἔμποροι Κιτιεῖς) to erect a temple to Aphrodite in the Piraeus, it being mentioned at the same time that the Egyptians (οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι) had already built a temple to Isis in the same place (*Corp. Inscr. Attic.* ii. 1, n. 168). At the beginning of the second century B.C. we find a community of Tyrian merchants in the island of Delos (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 2271: ἡ σύνοδος τῶν Τυρίων ἐμπόρων καὶ ναυκλήρων).[119] Then we learn from an inscription belonging to the year 174 A.D. that at that date there lived in Puteoli a community of Tyrians who requested assistance from home to enable them to carry on the observance of their native worship (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 5853: οἱ ἐν Ποτιόλοις κατοικοῦντες, *scil.* Τύριοι).[120] In Puteoli there were

[119] On the date of this inscription, see Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, p. 225. At pp. 223–225 of this work we also find a more correct text of the inscription than that of the *Corp. Inscr.*

[120] On this interesting inscription, comp. the commentary of Mommsen

also cultores Iovis Heliopolitani Berytenses qui Puteolis consistunt (Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* 1246 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. x. n 1634). But these Orientals, when they came to the West, were not contented with merely forming themselves into such communities as we have just referred to, but exactly like the Jews they endeavoured to win converts to their religion among the Greeks and Romans, and that sometimes with great success. We know in fact that even in early times the Greek religion owed not a little to the influence of the East. In the Hellenistic period again Oriental worships came to be more and more in vogue. Then as early as the latter days of the Republic we find the worship of the Egyptian gods already naturalized in Rome, while this was followed by the establishment in imperial times of the Syrian and Persian worships, above all that of Mithras (for more on this point, see No. 5, below). With the view of cultivating those worships, where they did not happen to be established and maintained directly by the State itself, the adherents of them also formed themselves into religious associations which, as regards their internal organization and their political position, are to be conceived of as being in every respect analogous to the corporations of foreign merchants mentioned above. Both in Greece and in Rome the law of the land contained express legal provisions for the benefit of those associations under the shelter of which it became possible for them to attain to a highly flourishing condition. In Greece these associations are met with from the beginning of the fourth century B.C. downwards, and that under the name of *θίασοι* or *ἔρανοι*. And notwithstanding their diversity otherwise, they are all characterized by certain common features, as might be expected from their being all of them so far under State regulation.[121] In Rome again, and

in the transactions of the *Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.*, philologico-historical department, 1850, p. 57 sqq.

[121] On the religious associations in Greece, comp. Wescher, *Revue archéo-*

that from an early period, there were *collegia* for a great variety of purposes, sometimes for objects chiefly religious, sometimes for those of a political character (but forbidden since the time of Caesar and Augustus), sometimes with a view to the mutual help of their members, above all for the purpose of securing them honourable burial (collegia tenuiorum, collegia funeraticia). The main distinction between these and the sacerdotia publica populi Romani lay in this, that while recognised by the State they were not publicly endowed, but had to depend for their support upon the voluntary contributions of their members.[122]

The position of voluntary religious associations as we have here described it, was precisely that which the *Jewish communities* also occupied now both in Greece and Rome, except in those instances in which, as in Alexandria, they enjoyed political privileges of a still more extensive character, which however was certainly not the case in Greece proper

*logique*, new series, vol. x. 1864, p. 460 sqq., xii. 1865, p. 214 sqq., xiii. 1866, p. 245 sqq. Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs, thiases, éranes, orgéons, avec la texte des inscriptions relatives à ces associations*, Paris 1873. Lüder's *Die dionysischen Künstler*, Berlin 1873. Heinrici, *Die Christengemeinde Korinths und die religiösen Genossenschaften der Griechen* (*Zeitschr. für Wissensch. Theol.* 1876, pp. 465–526, particularly p. 479 sqq.). Idem, *Zur Geschichte der Anfange paulinischer Gemeinden* (*ibid.* 1877, pp. 89-130). Neumann, Θιασῶται Ἰησοῦ (*Jahrbb. für prot. Theol.* 1885, pp. 123–125).

[122] On the Roman *collegia*, comp. above all Mommsen, *De collegiis et sodaliciis*, 1843. Idem, *Zeitschr. für geschichtl. Rechtswissenschaft*, vol. xv. 1850, p. 353 sqq. Max Cohn, *Zum römischen Vereinsrecht*, Berlin 1873 (and the notice of it in Bursian's *Philol. Jahresbericht*, 1873, ii. 885–890). Boissier, *La religion romaine d'Auguste aux Antonins*, 2nd ed. 1878, ii. 238-304. Duruy, *Du régime municipal dans l'empire romain* (*Revue historique*, vol. i. 1876, p. 355 sqq.). De Rossi, *Roma sotteranea*, vol. iii. 1877, p. 37 sqq., and especially p. 507 sqq. For an excellent summary of the whole matter, consult Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, pp. 131–142. For additional literature, see Hatch, *Die Gesellschaftsverfassung der christlichen Kirchen im Alterthum* (German edition, 1883), p. 20. A considerable amount of material is furnished by the indices to the *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* The *Digest*, xlvii. 22, de collegiis et corporibus, is important as bearing upon the juridical side of the matter.

nor in Rome. In the dominions of the *Ptolemies* and the *Seleucidae* the toleration of the Jewish communities and their religion was simply a matter of course. Indeed the first of the Ptolemies and the Seleucidae conferred important political privileges upon the Jews who resided within their kingdoms (see below, paragraph 3). Ptolemy II. is said to have gone even the length of causing the Jewish law to be translated into Greek, and Ptolemy III. to have gone so far as to offer sacrifice in Jerusalem.[123] No doubt when it was becoming more and more evident that the Jews were disposed to treat Hellenism rather contemptuously, and that unlike all other nations they insisted in maintaining a strong wall of partition, so far as religious matters were concerned, between themselves and every other people, several kings such as *Antiochus Epiphanes* for example tried to break down this opposition—tried to suppress the Jewish religion by force. But history teaches us that every attempt to do this only proved a failure, and we find that on the whole the toleration of former days continues to be enjoyed in later times as well. One of the foremost among the friends of the Jews was Ptolemy VI. (Philometor), who went so far as to sanction the erection of a Jewish temple in Egypt (see paragraph 4, below). And if Ptolemy VII. (Physcon) assumed an attitude of hostility toward the Jews, he did so not because of their religious, but their political partisanship.[124] In a similar way the *legislation*

[123] On the friendly disposition generally of the first Ptolemies toward the Jews, see Josephus, *contra Apion.* ii. 4–5.

[124] Josephus (*c. Apion.* ii. 5) relates the following incident in connection with Ptolemy VII. (Physcon): After the death of Ptolemy VI., Ptolemy VII. tried to supplant Cleopatra the widow and successor of the former, and whose army was under the command of the Jewish general Onias. Well then when Ptolemy was marching out against Onias he ordered the Jews of Alexandria to be put in chains and then thrown down in the way of the elephants, in order that these might trample upon them and crush them. But instead of that, the elephants turned against the friends of the king, who on seeing this regretted what he had done and at once desisted. By

*of the Romans* expressly conceded to the Jews the free observance of their own religion, and extended its protection to them when sundry attempts were made to suppress it. But it was Caesar and Augustus to whom they were chiefly indebted for their formal recognition within the Roman Empire. Josephus (*Antt.* xiv. 10, xvi. 6) has transmitted to us a large number of public enactments, partly decrees of the Senate, partly edicts of Caesar and Augustus, and partly those of certain Roman officials or municipal authorities of that period—all of which have as their object the securing to the Jews of the free observance of their own religion, and the further confirmation of their privileges.[125] As a rule the policy of Caesar was peculiarly unfavourable to those free unions, because at that time they were often made use of for political purposes, and so for this reason the emperor found it necessary to prohibit all *collegia* except those of ancient standing.[126] But the Jewish

way of commemorating this miraculous escape the Jews of Alexandria have been in the habit ever since of holding a thanksgiving festival every year. The story of the miraculous escape from being crushed to death by the elephants also forms the main subject of that absurd piece of romance known as the *third Book of Maccabees*, where it is likewise mentioned that the Jews have observed an annual thanksgiving festival ever since (3 Macc. vi. 36). Here however it is not Ptolemy VII. but Ptolemy IV. that is the hero of the story. This parallel, as well as the contents themselves, tend to make the story more than doubtful. But if this much be historical, that Ptolemy VII. assumed an attitude of hostility towards the Jews, then it was not in consequence of their religion that he did so, but owing to their having espoused the side of Cleopatra.

[125] On those enactments, comp. Gronovius, *Decreta Romana et Asiatica pro Judaeis*, Lugd. Bat. 1712. Krebs, *Decreta Romanorum pro Judaeis facta e Josepho collecta*, Lips. 1768. Mendelssohn, *Senati consulta Romanorum quae sunt in Josephi Antiquitatibus* (*Acta societatis phil.*, Lips. ed. Ritschelius, vol. v. 1875, pp. 87–288). The notice of this work in the *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, pp. 390–396. Niese, *Bemerkungen über die Urkunden bei Josephus Archäol.*, books xiii. xiv. xvi. (Hermes, vol. xi. 1876, pp. 466–488). Mendelssohn's reply to the latter, *Rhein. Museum*, new series, xxxii. 1877, pp. 249–258. For additional literature, see § 3, above (the paragraph on Josephus).

[126] Sueton. *Caesar*, xlii: Cuncta collegia praeter antiquitus constituta

communities were expressly exempted, it being further ordained that in future they were not to be forbidden to have a common fund of their own, and to hold meetings or gatherings.[127] And accordingly on one occasion we find a Roman official appealing to this decree when issuing instructions to the authorities of Paros not to interfere with the Jews in the practice of their religious observances.[128] In like manner the four public enactments, which Josephus has brought together in *Antt.* xiv. 10. 20–24, are doubtless to be traced to the influence of Caesar. They all of them serve directly or indirectly to guarantee to the Jews of Asia Minor the undisturbed exercise of their own religious observances.[129] After

distraxit. The prohibition was subsequently repeated by Augustus, Sueton. *Aug.* xxxii.: Collegia praeter antiqua et legitima dissolvit.

[127] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8: Καὶ γὰρ Γαῖος Καῖσαρ ὁ ἡμέτερος στρατηγὸς καὶ ὕπατος ἐν διατάγματι κωλύων θιάσους συνάγεσθαι κατὰ πόλιν, μόνους τούτους οὐκ ἐκώλυσεν οὔτε χρήματα συνεισφέρειν οὔτε σύνδειπνα ποιεῖν.

[128] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 8. The texts of those documents are reproduced so carelessly that in many instances it is no longer possible to make out who the Roman names are intended for. The name of the official who addressed the communication to the Parians is given in the transmitted text as Ἰούλιος Γαῖος, which in any case is a corruption. Mendelssohn (*Acta societatis philol.*, Lips. v. pp. 212–216) conjectures that it is Σερουίλιος Οὐατίας, proconsul of Asia 46–45 B.C., that is meant.

[129] The four enactments are as follow: (1) A communication from the authorities of Laodicea to a Roman official (proconsul of Asia?), in which they assure him that, in conformity with his instructions, they would not interfere with the Jews in the observance of the Sabbath and the practice of their own religious usages (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 20). (2) A communication from the proconsul of Asia to the authorities of Miletus, in which these latter are enjoined not to interfere with the Jews in their observance of the Sabbath, and in the practice of their religious rites, and to allow them to dispose of their earnings in the way they have been accustomed to, τοὺς καρποὺς μεταχειρίζεσθαι καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21). (3) A public decree of the city of Halicarnassus (ψήφισμα Ἁλικαρνασσέων), pursuant to which the Jews were to be allowed, τά τε σάββατα ἄγειν καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ συντελεῖν κατὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαϊκοὺς νόμους καὶ τὰς προσευχὰς ποιεῖσθαι πρὸς τῇ θαλάσσῃ κατὰ τὸ πάτριον ἔθος (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 23; on the offering up prayers by the seashore, see § 27, p. 72). (4) A public decree of the town of Sardes, to the effect (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 24) that the Jews were to

the death of Caesar the two contending parties vied with each other in maintaining the privileges of the Jews. On the one side we find Dolabella, the warm supporter of Antony, and who in the year 43 B.C. took possession of Asia Minor, ratifying the privilege of exemption from military service, and of observing their own religious worship conferred upon the Jews of that province by previous governors, and sending a communication to the authorities of Ephesus to apprize them of this.[130] On the other again we find Marcus Junius Brutus, who in Asia Minor was preparing in the spring of the year 42 B.C. to march against Antony and Octavianus, prevailing upon the people of Ephesus to issue a public edict declaring that the Jews were not to be interfered with in the observance of the Sabbath and their other sacred usages.[131] *In consequence of all this, Judaism acquired such a legal standing that it came to be treated as a religio licita throughout the whole extent of*

be allowed to meet on the days appointed by them for the celebration of their religious observances, and further that the magistrates of the town were to assign them a place of their own "on which to build and in which to reside" (*εἰς οἰκοδομίαν καὶ οἴκησιν αὐτῶν*, though from the petition of the Jews previously mentioned it would appear that it was only the building of a synagogue that was in question). These enactments seem to be traceable to one and the same stimulus emanating from Rome. Mendelssohn's conjecture, that the stimulus in question was a decree of the Senate, passed in the year 46 B.C., is doubtful. See Mendelssohn, *Acta societatis philol.*, Lips. vol. v. pp. 205 sq., 211 sq., 217–228. For the name of the proconsul who addressed the injunction to the Milesians (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21), see Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847, p. 684. Waddington, *Fastes des provinces asiatiques de l'empire romain*, pt. i. 1872 (reprinted from Le Bas et Waddington's *Inscriptions*, vol. iii.), p. 75, and Mendelssohn's reply in his notice of the work in the *Jenaër Literaturzeitung*, 1874, art. 341. Ritschl, *Rhein. Museum*, 1874, p. 340 f. Mendelssohn, *Acta*, v. 212 f. The probable reading is Πόπλιος Σερουίλιος Ποπλίου υἱὸς Οὐατίας (Vatia).

130 *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11–12. Mendelssohn's observations on this passage, *Acta*, v. 247–250.

131 *Antt.* xiv. 10. 25. Mendelssohn's observations on the passage, *Acta*, v. 251–254. In the generally received text the name of *M. Junius Brutus* is corrupted into Μάικῳ Ἰουλίῳ Πομπηίῳ υἱῷ Βρούτου. For various suggestions as to how it might be corrected, see Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847 p. 687, note. Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 74. Mendelssohn, *Acta*, v. 254.

*the Roman Empire.*[132] That the Jews living in *the city* of Rome also shared in these legal privileges is specially vouched for by Philo with regard to the time of Augustus.[133] At the same time, if we may judge from what we know to have been the case in regard to other foreign worships, it must be assumed that down to the second century of our era the Jews of Rome were not at liberty to celebrate their religious observances within the *pomaerium.*[134]

In the recognition of the Jewish communities and their worship on the part of the State two important privileges are virtually included: the *right of administering their own funds* and *jurisdiction over their own members.* To the former of these prominence had already been given over and over again in the edicts issued in Caesar's time.[135] This was a matter of special importance to the Jews, as otherwise they would have been unable to fulfil their obligations to the

[132] The expression *religio licita* is derived from Tertullian, *Apologet.* chap. xxi.: *insignissima religio, certe licita.* It does not otherwise belong to the technical phraseology of Roman legislation. This latter speaks rather of *collegia licita* (*Digest.* xlvii. 22). For the decisive point here lies in this, that to the adherents of any particular worship permission is granted to organize themselves as a *corporation* and *to meet together* for the celebration of their worship. Hence the formula *coire, convenire licet*, which is also of frequent occurrence in the toleration edicts issued in favour of the Jews.

[133] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 f.). It is there stated with reference to the way in which Augustus had acted toward the Jews of Rome that: Ἠπίστατο οὖν καὶ προσευχὰς ἔχοντας καὶ συνιόντας εἰς αὐτάς, καὶ μάλιστα ταῖς ἱεραῖς ἑβδόμαις, ὅτε δημοσίᾳ τὴν πάτριον παιδεύονται Φιλοσοφίαν. Ἠπίστατο καὶ χρήματα συναγαγόντας ἀπὸ τῶν ἀπαρχῶν ἱερά, καὶ πέμποντας εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα διὰ τῶν τὰς θυσίας ἀναζόντων. Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὔτε ἐξῴκισε τῆς Ῥώμης ἐκείνους, οὔτε τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν αὐτῶν ἀΦείλετο πολιτείαν, ὅτι τῆς καὶ Ἰουδαϊκῆς ἐΦρόντιζεν, οὔτε ἐνεωτέρισεν εἰς τὰς προσευχάς, οὔτε ἐκώλυσε συνάγεσθαι πρὸς τὰς τῶν νόμων ὑΦηγήσεις, οὔτε ἠναντιώθη τοῖς ἀπαρχομένοις. Comp. also *ibid.* § 40 (Mang. ii. 592).

[134] Comp. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 35.

[135] Caesar himself conferred upon the Jews the right χρήματα συνεισΦέρειν (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21). In the communication addressed by the proconsul of Asia to the Milesians (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 21), permission is given to the Jews τοὺς καρπους μεταχειρίζεσθαι καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶν αὐτοῖς.

temple at Jerusalem and to send thither the tribute prescribed by the law. But it was precisely this draining away of money from the provinces that seemed peculiarly offensive in the eyes of the Gentile authorities. We learn from Cicero's speech in behalf of Flaccus, that this latter, during his administration of Asia, in several places confiscated the money thus collected by Jews with the view of forwarding it to Jerusalem.[136] Further, the municipal authorities in Asia would seem to have gone on acting in a similar manner even after the edicts of Caesar's time and actually in defiance of them. Consequently the public documents belonging to the time of Augustus refer principally to this point. As Augustus had sanctioned the remitting of these sums of money from Rome itself,[137] so the municipalities of Asia Minor and Cyrene are enjoined not to interpose any obstacle in the way of the Jews in regard to this matter.[138] Further, the appropriation of all such monies was to be punished as sacrilege.[139] And that those decrees

[136] Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, xxviii.: Quum aurum Judaeorum nomine quotannis ex Italia et ex omnibus provinciis Hierosolyma exportari soleret, Flaccus sanxit edicto, ne ex Asia exportari liceret. . . . Ubi ergo crimen est? quoniam quidem furtum nusquam reprehendis, edictum probas, judicatum fateris, quaesitum et prolatum palam non negas, actum esse per viros primarios res ipsa declarat: Apameae manifesto deprehensum, ante pedes praetoris in foro expensum esse auri pondo centum paullo minus per Sex. Caesium, equitem Romanum, castissimum hominem atque integerrimum; Laodiceae viginti pondo paullo amplius per hunc L. Peducaeum, judicem nostrum, Adramyttii per Cn. Domitium legatum; Pergami non multum. Previous to this Mithridates had appropriated the sums belonging to the Jews in Cos (*Antt.* xiv. 7. 2).

[137] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (ed. Mang. ii. 568 sq.).

[138] Joseph. *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (ed. Mang. ii. 592).

[139] *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 4. The decrees which Josephus has collected in *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2–7 have evidently been the outcome of those negotiations, an account of which is given in *Antt.* xvi. 2. 3–5 (comp. also xii. 3. 2). When, for example, Herod happened to be visiting Agrippa in Asia Minor in the year 14 B.C., the Jews in that quarter took occasion to complain of the oppression to which they were being subjected at the hands of the municipal authorities throughout the province, declaring that they had been

were still in force in the time of the Vespasian war is evident from an incidental utterance that on one occasion fell from the lips of Titus.[140] It was a matter of no less importance to the Jews to be allowed *to exercise jurisdiction over the members of their own community.* For, as the Mosaic law concerned itself not only with acts of worship but with the affairs of ordinary life as well, these latter being also subjected to the regulative principles of a divine law, it was utterly repugnant to Jewish ideas of things that they should be tried by any other than Jewish law.[141] Wherever the Jews went they took their own law along with them, and in accordance with it they administered justice among the members of their community. Evidences of this are to be found above all in the New Testament. The Apostle Paul, for example, obtains a warrant from the Sanhedrim in Jerusalem for the arrest of certain converts to Christianity among the Jews living in Damascus (Acts ix. 2). In other places again he causes such converts to be put in prison and scourged (Acts xxii. 19, xxvi. 11). Subsequently he himself was scourged by the Jews five times for being a Christian (2 Cor. xi. 24), on which occasions it is doubtless Jewish communities living abroad that are in question and not those of Palestine. In Corinth the proconsul Gallio directs the Jews to carry their complaint against Paul before their own authorities, on the ground that he would be prepared to interfere only if Paul had been charged with a criminal offence, but not if it was merely a question of transgressing the Jewish law (Acts xviii. 12–16);

despoiled of the money intended for the temple, and that they were compelled to appear in the courts of law on the Sabbath. Agrippa protected the Jews against any invasion of their rights in regard to both of those matters. But it was also to these very points that the toleration edicts in question had reference.

[140] *Bell. Jud.* vi. 6. 2 (Bekker, pp. 107, 22 sqq.): δασμολογεῖν τε ὑμῖν ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ καὶ ἀναθήματα συλλέγειν ἐπετρέψαμεν κ.τ.λ.

[141] Comp. the Rabbinical passages in Wetstein, *Nov. Test.*, note on 1 Cor. vi. 1.

and then he quietly looks on and allows the Jews to maltreat Sosthenes, the ruler of the synagogue, under his very eyes (Acts xviii. 17). From all this it will be seen that practically at all events the Jews exercised not only civil, but even criminal jurisdiction over the members of their communities. But whether they were actually warranted in doing so is open to question. In any case the foreign communities would doubtless be subject to certain restrictions in this respect, similar to those imposed upon the Jews in Palestine in the time of the procurators. But it is certain that in *civil causes* they enjoyed an independent jurisdiction, not merely in Alexandria (see above, p. 244), but elsewhere as well. Even before the time of Caesar we find such jurisdiction expressly conceded to the Jews of Sardes in a communication addressed to the authorities of that town by Lucius Antonius (governor of the province of Asia in 50–49 B.C.).[142] And we see from the legislation of the Christian emperors that in later times as well the Jewish communities were everywhere left in the enjoyment of this privilege (see below at the close of the present paragraph).

As the requirements of Jewish legalism might easily bring the Jews of the dispersion into collision with the arrangements of civil life, they could hope to enjoy the absolutely free exercise of their own religion only in those cases where the civil legislation and government did not require of them anything that was incompatible with their own law. But even in this respect Roman tolerance made large concessions

[142] Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 17: Ἰουδαῖοι πολῖται ἡμέτεροι προσελθόντες μοι ἐπέδειξαν ἑαυτοὺς σύνοδον ἔχειν ἰδίαν κατὰ τοὺς πατρίους νόμους ἀπ' ἀρχῆς καὶ τόπον ἴδιον, ἐν ᾧ τά τε πράγματα καὶ τὰς πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀντιλογίας κρίνουσι· τοῦτό τε αἰτησαμένοις ἵν' ἐξῇ αὐτοῖς ποιεῖν, τηρῆσαι καὶ ἐπιτρέψαι ἔκρινα. On L. Antonius, a brother of the triumvir M. Antony, see Pauly's *Encyclop.* i. 1. 1182 sq. Bergmann, *Philologus*, 1847, p. 680. Waddington, *Fastes*, p. 63. Mendelssohn, *Acta societatis phil.*, Lips. v. 169, 186.

to the Jews. One of the most important of them was *exemption from military service.* For Jews to perform such service in any but a Jewish army would be simply impossible, for on the Sabbath they were forbidden either to bear arms or to march farther than 2000 cubits.[143] This matter assumed a somewhat practical character when, at the breaking out of the civil war between Caesar and Pompey in the year 47 B.C., Pompey's party endeavoured to raise large levies of troops throughout the whole of the East. In the province of Asia alone the consul Lentulus raised as many as two legions of Roman citizens.[144] Now if it was the case, as precisely on this very occasion we are informed it was, that in that quarter there was also a large number of Jews who enjoyed the rights of Roman citizenship, then they too would be liable to this conscription. But at their own request Lentulus granted them the privilege of exemption from military service, and issued instructions to this effect to all the authorities everywhere who had charge of the conscription.[145] Then six years after this (43 B.C.) Dolabella confirmed the Jews of this same province in their privilege of ἀστρατεία, and in doing so he expressly appealed to the previous edicts.[146] In Palestine also was this same privilege conceded to them by Caesar.[147] Among the *other privileges* that were conceded to them in deference to the requirements of Jewish legalism, we might further mention that, in pursuance of an order to that effect by Augustus, the Jews were not to be

[143] For the prohibition with regard to bearing arms, consult Mishna, *Shabbath* vi. 2–4; and for the marching, see above, p. 102; also *Antt.* xiii. 8. 4, xiv. 10. 12.

[144] Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* iii. 4: (Pompejus) legiones effecerat civium Romanorum IX. . . . duas ex Asia, quas Lentulus consul conscribendas curaverat.

[145] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 13, 14, 16, 18, 19. Comp. Mendelssohn on this passage in *Acta soc. phil.*, Lips. v. 167–188; *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, p. 393.

[146] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 11–12.

[147] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 6.

compelled to appear in a court of law on the Sabbath;[148] that when a public distribution of money or corn took place and the day of the distribution fell on a Sabbath, then in pursuance of a similar order by the same emperor, their share of the money or the corn was to be delivered to them on the day following;[149] and lastly, that instead of the oil furnished by the provinces and which Jews were forbidden to make use of, they were to receive an equivalent in money,—a usage the continuance of which was confirmed to the Jews of Antioch, for example, by the governor Mucianus in the time of the Vespasian war.[150]

This whole position of the Jews with regard to their enjoyment of public rights was never materially or permanently altered at any subsequent period. Sometimes no doubt the imperial legislation introduced certain restrictions, and Judaism was also subjected now and then to temporary persecution. But nothing of the nature of a lasting or material change took place in the existing state of things till down toward later imperial times. The measures used by Tiberius against Roman Jews were confined exclusively to the city of Rome. No doubt a serious crisis arose in the time of Caligula. But it was precisely in such a crisis that it was seen how important it was for the Jews to be able to take their stand upon the public rights they had now so long enjoyed. For nothing was more calculated seriously to endanger the religious freedom of the Jews than the introduction and gradual diffusion of *the worship of the emperors*. The more that such worship was being promoted by public authority, it would necessarily have more and more

[148] *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2 and 4 (the technical phrase ἐγγύας ὁμολογεῖν means to give a guarantee that one will appear before a court). On the occasion of those decrees, see note 139.

[149] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (ed. Mang. ii. 569).

[150] Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1. On the prohibition against the use of oil supplied by Gentiles, see above, § 22, vol. i. p. 55.

the appearance of an act of disloyalty on the part of the Jews when they refused to join in it. And so at a time when Caligula was everywhere peremptorily insisting upon the observance of that worship, which, ever since Augustus, had been introduced again and again by people from the provinces in the heat of their own zeal (see § 22, vol. i. p. 16), the religious freedom of the Jews would have been irretrievably lost had the demand been consistently enforced in their case as well. As long as Caligula lived the attempt to do so was actually made, and history can tell what frightful storms were conjured up for the Jews in consequence (see § 17[c]). But fortunately for them the reign of Caligula was but of short duration. Claudius his successor lost no time in simply restoring the previous state of matters by issuing a decree of universal toleration.[151] Since then the idea of forcing the Jews to take part in emperor worship has never been seriously thought of. Their title to exemption was regarded as an ancient privilege, a circumstance which placed them in a much more favourable position than the Christians enjoyed. The subsequent treatment of the Roman Jews by Claudius was confined, like that of Tiberius, to Rome itself, and did not lead to any permanent result. Even the reign of Nero, thanks to the Empress Poppaea, was on the whole favourable to the Jews (comp. note 74). The result of the great Vespasian war and the destruction of Jerusalem, so far as the Jews of the dispersion were concerned, was this, that the tax of two drachmae previously paid to the temple at Jerusalem was from that time forward to be given to the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.[152] No doubt to have to do this was a thing somewhat repugnant to the feelings of a Jew. But in

[151] *Antt.* xix. 5. 2–3.

[152] Joseph. *Bell. Jud.* vii. 6. 6. Dio Cass. lxvi. 7. For the history of this tax, comp. Zorn, *Historia fisci Judaici sub imperio veterum Romanorum*, 1734.

no other respect did Vespasian do anything to prejudice the religious freedom of the Jews. Their political rights are expressly safeguarded by him even in Alexandria and Antioch for example.[153] Domitian insisted in the most rigorous manner possible upon the payment of the two drachmae tax,[154] and visited with severe punishment such of the Romans as became converts to Judaism.[155] But the existing rights of the Jews were not rescinded. Under Nerva again certain alleviations were granted with regard to both the points just mentioned. As for the two-drachmae tax, though not abolished, it was imposed in a less offensive form,[156] and it was no longer allowable to prosecute any one on the charge of having adopted "Jewish modes of life."[157] A violent disturbance of the existing state of things, nay the most violent that the Jews had ever experienced since Caligula's time, was brought about by the serious struggles that took place in the reign of Trajan and Hadrian. Hadrian had gone so far—

[153] Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1; *Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2. Comp. paragraph 3, below.

[154] Sueton. *Domitian.* xii.: Judaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est; ad quem deferebantur, qui vel inprofessi Judaicam viverent vitam, vel dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pependissent. Interfuisse me adulescentulum memini, cum a procuratore frequentissimoque consilio inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset.

[155] Dio Cass. lxvii. 14: *καὶ ἄλλοι ἐς τὰ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθη ἐξοκέλλοντες πολλοὶ κατεδικάσθησαν, καὶ οἱ μὲν ἀπέθανον, οἱ δὲ τῶν γοῦν οὐσιῶν ἐστερήθησαν.*

[156] This we are bound to infer from the coins of Nerva's time, with their inscription: Fisci Judaici calumnia sublata (Madden's *History of Jewish Coinage*, p. 199, and elsewhere). Seeing that the tax is found to be still in existence at a later period (Appian, *Syr.* l.; Origen, *Epist. ad African.* § 14; Tertull. *Apologet.* chap. xviii.: *vectigalis libertas*=freedom purchased by payment of a tax), what is meant cannot be that the tax was abolished altogether, but that it was exacted in a form less calculated to offend the religious scruples of the Jews. It may be conjectured that from this time forth they were not to be called upon to pay it as for the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus.

[157] Dio Cass. lxviii. 1: *οὐτ' ἀσεβεῖας οὔτ' Ἰουδαϊκοῦ βίου καταιτιασθαί τινας συνεχώρησε.*

and this was the cause of the insurrection in his time—as to issue a formal prohibition of the rite of circumcision,[158] a prohibition that was hardly revoked after the successful quelling of the rising. But his successor Antoninus Pius granted permission to circumcise in the case of native Jews, and confined the prohibition to Gentiles.[159] In like manner Septimius Severus contented himself with merely prohibiting conversions to Judaism,[160] and this continued to be also the standpoint of several Christian emperors who were not otherwise favourably disposed toward the Jewish religion.[161] It will be seen therefore that the whole of the repressive measures aimed merely at preventing the further spread of Judaism. As far as native Jews were concerned, their existing public rights were not interfered with to any appreciable extent. As showing this, there are three points that are worth noting. (1) As in earlier,[162] so also in later times the Jewish *worship* continued to enjoy the formal protection of the State. On one occasion when Callistus, subsequently a bishop (in the time of Bishop Victor, 189–199 A.D.), ventured to disturb Jewish worship in Rome, the Jews prosecuted him for doing so before Fascianus the prefect of the city, who sentenced the offender to be banished to the mines of Sardinia.[163] Of the Christian emperors, even those of them who were unfavourably disposed toward the Jews, and who had forbidden the building of new synagogues, had nevertheless no objection to

[158] Spartian. *Hadrian.* xiv.: moverunt ea tempestate et Judaei bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia.

[159] *Digest.* xlviii. 8. 11, pr.: Circumcidere Judaeis filios suos tantum rescripto divi Pii permittitur: in non ejusdem religionis qui hoc fecerit, castrantis poena irrogatur.

[160] Spartian. *Sept. Sev.* xvii.: Judaeos fieri sub gravi poena vetuit.

[161] On this see *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8.

[162] Comp. especially the ψήφισμα Ἀλικαρνασσέων, Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 10. 23: ἂν δέ τις κωλύσῃ ἢ ἄρχων ἢ ἰδιώτης, τῷδε τῷ ζημιώματι ὑπεύθινος ἔστω καὶ ὀφειλέτω τῇ πόλει.

[163] Hippolyti, *Philosophumena*, ix. 12.

place the existing ones under the protection of the laws of the empire.[164] (2) The Jewish communities continued to enjoy to quite the same extent as in former times the right of *administering their own funds.* Above all were they still permitted as much as ever (till toward the end of the fourth century of our era) to send their sacred tribute to the patriarchate in Palestine (the new central authority of the Jewish people after the destruction of Jerusalem). This tribute was collected every year by the *apostoli* sent out by the patriarchs for the purpose, and when thus collected it was conveyed to Palestine.[165] It was not till towards the close of the fourth century of our era that the civil authority began gradually to put a stop to this.[166] (3) In later imperial times the Jews were also permitted still to enjoy independent *jurisdiction* over the members of their own community, but of course exclusively in civil causes and only when the two parties in the case agreed to have the matter disposed of by a Jewish tribunal.[167] Powers of a very extensive character must have

[164] *Codex Theodosianus*, xvi. 8. 9, 12, 20, 21, 25, 26, 27.

[165] On these *apostoli* and their functions, see Euseb. *Comment. ad Jesaj.* xviii. 1 (*Collectio nova patrum*, ed. Montfaucon, ii. 425). Epiphan. *haer.* xxx. 4 and 11. Jerome, *ad Gal.* i. 1 (*Opp.* ed. Vallarsi, vii. 1. 363). *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 8. 14. Their chief duty would seem to have been to act as media of communication between the various Jewish communities. Hence we also meet with them in later times when the collecting of the tribute in question was no longer allowed, for example, in Venosa on the epitaph of a girl fourteen years of age, quei dixerunt trenus duo apostuli et duo rebbites (Hirschfeld, *Bullettino dell' Instituto di corrisp. archeol.* 1867, p. 152 = Ascoli, *Inscrizioni*, p. 61, n. 19 = *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. ix. n. 648 and 6220 = Lenormant, *Revue des études juives*, vol. vi. No. 12, p. 205).

[166] On the suppression of this practice (which did not take place all at once), comp. Julian, *Epist.* xxv. *Codex Theodos.* xvi. 8. 14, 17, 29.

[167] *Cod. Theodos.* ii. 1. 10: Sane si qui per compromissum, ad similitudinem arbitrorum, apud Judaeos vel patriarchas ex consensu partium in civili duntaxat negotio putaverint litigandum, sortiri eorum judicium jure publico non vetentur: eorum etiam sententias provinciarum judices exsequantur, tamquam ex sententia cognitoris arbitri fuerint attributi (edict of the Emperors Arcadius and Honorius of the year 398 A.D.). Comp. further, *Cod. Theodos.* xvi. 8. 8.

been in the hands of the Jewish ethnarch or patriarch in Palestine, who after the destruction of the Jewish state formed the supreme head of the people. The whole of the communities of the dispersion seem to have submitted to his jurisdiction without any hesitation. And so full were the prerogatives he exercised, that the Fathers of the Church felt themselves under the necessity of taking very considerable pains in order to show that, notwithstanding those prerogatives, the sceptre had been taken from Judah as far back as the time of Christ.[168] But there is perhaps nothing that indicates better the secure basis on which those political privileges of the Jews just described were found to rest, than the circumstance that in the time of the persecution of the Christians we even find instances of these latter becoming converts to Judaism for their own safety.[169]

### 3. *Their Equality in regard to the Rights of Citizenship.*

There can be no question that, in the majority of the older cities of Phoenicia, Syria, and Asia Minor, as well as in Greece proper, the Jews who went to live in them occupied the position of settlers (as opposed to citizens).[169a] We no doubt hear of occasional instances in which individual Jews

[168] Pamphil. *Apolog. pro Orig.* in Routh's *Reliquiae sacrae*, iv. 360. Cyrill, *Cateches.* xii. 17. Also in general, *Orig. ad African.* § 14 (for the passage, see vol. i. p. 173). Vopisc. *Vita Saturnin.* chap. viii. Chr. G. Fr. Walch, *Historia Patriarcharum Judaeorum, quorum in libris juris Romani fit mentio*, Jenae 1752.

[169] Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* vi. 12. 1.

[169a] This appears indirectly, above all, from Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 4. For in that passage the historian draws attention to it as being something unusual that the Jews should be in the enjoyment of the rights of citizens in Alexandria, Antioch and the cities of Ionia. Of course the list here given is not complete, for they also enjoyed similar rights in all the towns founded by Seleucus I. Still we can see that it was not usual for Jews to possess them.

have the rights of citizenship conferred upon them. Paul, for instance, who was a citizen of Tarsus (Acts xxi. 39), is a case in point. But, as a rule, the *Jewish communities* in those cities are to be regarded in the light of *private associations of settlers*, which were recognised by the State and on which certain rights were conferred, but the members of which did not enjoy the rights of citizenship and consequently were also debarred from having a voice in the direction of the affairs of the city. Still there was after all a pretty large number of towns in which the Jews enjoyed the *rights of citizenship*. This was true above all of the towns more recently built in the Hellenistic period, and pre-eminently of the foremost amongst them, viz. Antioch and Alexandria, the capitals of the kingdoms of the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies respectively. Seleucus I. Nicator († 280 B.C.) conferred the rights of citizenship upon the Jews living *in all the towns founded by himself* in Asia Minor and Syria,[170] rights which they were all found to be still enjoying in the time of Josephus.[171] The most important of these towns was Antioch, where the rights of the Jews were inscribed upon tablets of brass.[172] They also continued to enjoy their rights of citizenship there at a later period, not only under the Seleucidae after Antiochus Epiphanes, but under the Romans as well.[173] Even in the time of the great Vespasian war Titus declined to accede to the urgent request of the people of Antioch to deprive the Jews of the rights of citizenship by simply appealing to their ancient privileges.[174] In like manner in Alexandria the

[170] For a list of them consult Appian. *Syr.* lvii.

[171] Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 3. 1: Σέλευκος ὁ Νικάτωρ ἐν αἷς ἔκτισε πόλεσιν ἐν τῇ Ἀσίᾳ καὶ τῇ κάτω Συρίᾳ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ μητροπόλει Ἀντιοχείᾳ πολιτείας αὐτοὺς ἠξίωσε, καὶ τοῖς ἐνοικισθεῖσιν ἰσοτίμους ἀπέδειξε Μακεδόσι καὶ Ἕλλησιν, ὡς τὴν πολιτείαν ταύτην ἔτι καὶ νῦν διαμένειν.

[172] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2. Comp. in general, besides *Antt.* xii. 3. 1, also *contra Apion.* ii. 4: αὐτῶν γὰρ ἡμῶν οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν κατοικοῦντες Ἀντιοχεῖς ὀνομάζονται· τὴν γὰρ πολιτείαν αὐτοῖς ἔδωκεν ὁ κτίστης Σέλευκος.

[173] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3. [174] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2; *Antt.* xii. 3. 1.

Jews obtained citizen rights when the city was founded.[175] Alexander the Great conferred upon them "equal rights with the Macedonians" (who are no other than just the regular citizens of Alexandria), while the Diadochoi granted them permission to call themselves Macedonians.[176] Nor did any change take place with regard to those rights in the time of the Romans. They were expressly confirmed by Julius Caesar, as might be seen from what was inscribed upon a pillar set up in Alexandria, and which was still standing in Josephus' day.[177] It is true that, during the persecution in Caligula's time, the rights of the Alexandrian Jews were trampled under foot. But as soon as Claudius succeeded to the throne he lost no time in guaranteeing the continued existence of Jewish rights.[178] And as in Antioch so here too they were not curtailed in the slightest degree, even after the war of the year 70 of our era.[179]

[175] On the Jewish rights of citizenship in Alexandria, comp. Lumbroso, *Ricerche Alessandrine*, Turin 1871. Löscher in *Comm.* (90 pages large quarto; reprinted from the *Memorie della Reale Academia delle scienze di Torino*, 2nd series, vol. xxvii.). I am acquainted with this treatise only through the review of it in the *Literar. Centralbl.* 1873, No. 1.

[176] Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4: Εἰς κατοίκησιν δὲ αὐτοῖς ἔδωκε τόπον Ἀλέξανδρος, καὶ ἴσης παρὰ τοῖς Μακεδόσι τιμῆς ἐπέτυχον. . . . καὶ μέχρι νῦν αὐτῶν ἡ φυλὴ τὴν προσηγορίαν εἶχε Μακεδόνες. *Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7: Ἀλέξανδρος . . ἔδωκε τὸ μετοικεῖν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν ἐξ ἰσοτιμίας πρὸς Ἕλληνας. Διέμεινε δὲ αὐτοῖς ἡ τιμὴ καὶ παρὰ τῶν διαδόχων, οἳ καὶ τόπον ἴδιον αὐτοῖς ἀφώρισαν, ὅπως καθαρωτέραν ἔχοιεν τὴν δίαιταν, ἧττον ἐπιμισγομένων τῶν ἀλλοφύλων, καὶ γρηματίζειν ἐπέτρεψαν Μακεδόνας. Ἐπεί τε Ῥωμαῖοι κατεστήσαντο τὴν Αἴγυπτον, οὔτε Καῖσαρ ὁ πρῶτος οὔτε τῶν μετ' αὐτόν τις ὑπέμεινε τὰς ἀπὸ Ἀλεξάνδρου τιμὰς Ἰουδαίων ἐλαττῶσαι.

[177] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 1: Καῖσαρ Ἰούλιος τοῖς ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ Ἰουδαίοις ποιήσας χαλκῆν στήλην ἐδήλωσεν ὅτι Ἀλεξανδρέων πολῖται εἰσίν. *Apion.* ii. 4: τὴν στήλην τὴν ἑστῶσαν ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ καὶ τὰ δικαιώματα περιέχουσαν ἃ Καῖσαρ ὁ μέγας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἔδωκεν.

[178] *Antt.* xix. 5. 2 (with a glance back at the history of the citizen rights of the Jews of Alexandria).

[179] *Antt.* xii. 3. 1: κρατήσαντος Οὐεσπασιανοῦ καὶ Τίτου τοῦ υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ τῆς οἰκουμένης, δεηθέντες οἱ Ἀλεξανδρεῖς καὶ Ἀντιοχεῖς ἵνα τὰ δίκαια τῆς

Nor did the Jews enjoy the rights of citizenship merely in the towns newly founded in the Hellenistic period, but also in those on the *coast of Ionia* as well, and above all in Ephesus, in which towns those rights had been conferred upon them by Antiochus II. Theos (261–246 B.C.). When, in the time of Augustus, the municipal authorities in that quarter petitioned that the Jews should either be excluded from the enjoyment of the rights of citizenship, or be compelled to renounce their separate worship and conform to that of the native divinities, Agrippa, who happened to have the administration of the eastern provinces, maintained intact the ancient privileges of the Jews, whose interests on this occasion were represented by Nicolaus Damascenus, deputed to do so by Herod (in the year 14 B.C.).[180] We learn incidentally that the Jews also possessed the rights of citizenship in Sardes[181] for example, and not less so outside of Asia Minor as in the case of Cyrene.[182]

The position thus created for the Jews in consequence of possessing all those privileges was one involving an *internal contradiction*. On the one hand, they formed when living in

πολιτείας μηκέτι μένῃ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις, οὐκ ἐπέτυχον. Lumbroso (in the dissertation already referred to) expresses the opinion that Ptolemy IV. (Philopater) created a new order of citizen rights in Alexandria, which found its expression in the worship of Bacchus. Now, as the Jews were not at liberty to join in this worship they were excluded from this new order of citizen rights, and only retained the former designation of Macedonians though it had lost its original value. But it may be proved from what is said over and over again by Josephus, that no change whatever took place with regard to the political status of the Jews of Alexandria from the time of Alexander the Great till that of Vespasian; while the third Book of Maccabees, on which Lumbroso founds, is as a rule hardly to be appealed to as historical testimony.

[180] *Antt.* xii. 3. 2. *Apion.* ii. 4: οἱ ἐν Ἐφέσῳ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἄλλην Ἰωνίαν τοῖς αὐθιγενέσι πολίταις ὁμωνυμοῦσι, τοῦτο παρασχόντων αὐτοῖς τῶν διαδόχων. On the negotiations of the year 14 B.C., see besides *Antt.* xii. 3. 2 also *Antt.* xvi. 2. 3–5, and note 139, above.

[181] *Antt.* xiv. 10. 24.

[182] *Antt.* xvi. 6. 1. Marquardt, *Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 463.

Gentile cities a community of foreigners who, for the furtherance of their religious concerns, had organized themselves into an independent body, and whose religious views were hopelessly at variance with every species of Gentile worship. And yet, on the other, they participated as citizens in all the rights and duties of municipal life, they had seats and the right of voting in the civic councils, and had a share in the direction of the affairs of the city. This must of necessity have led to incessant collision. For the idea of separating religious from political concerns was, so long as it remained true to itself, altogether foreign to classical antiquity; it looked upon the worship of the native divinities as also forming an essential part of the public affairs of the city. And so how it must have been felt to be a standing contradiction to see in the very heart of the municipality, and enjoying all the rights of citizenship, a body of people who not only persisted in worshipping their own God alongside those of the city, but who assailed every form of Gentile worship whatever as an abomination. *Such a thing as the toleration of various worships alongside of each other was really possible only within the cosmopolitan circle of the Roman Empire.* For there was realized in all its fulness the fundamental thought for which Hellenism paved the way, that every man is free to be happy after his own fashion. Consequently there was room here for Jews as well. In the municipal towns, on the other hand, which clung to the ancient modes of life in matters of religion as well, the Jews must have been felt to be a continual thorn in the sides of their fellow-citizens. It is therefore not to be wondered at—rather should we say that it entirely accords with the historical development of things, that the Jews should have been persecuted by the municipal towns, whereas the higher authority of the Roman Empire took them under its wing. In those towns there were outbursts of hatred against the

Jews on every occasion, and that above all in those of them in which they enjoyed the rights of citizenship, such as Alexandria, Antioch, many of the towns of Asia Minor, and also Caesarea in Palestine where the ἰσοπολιτεία was conferred upon Jews and Gentiles by Herod the Great.[183] One of the principal accusations against the Jews on those occasions was precisely this, that they refused to worship the gods of the city.[184] But the Roman authorities always came to the rescue and safeguarded the religious freedom of the Jews in so far as these latter did not themselves forfeit their rights by showing revolutionary tendencies. It is well worth noting how, in the address in which Nicolaus Damascenus pleads for the rights of the Jews being respected, it is pointed out

[183] In Alexandria Jews and Gentiles lived in a state of constant feud ever since the city was founded (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 7); and in Caligula's time it was here above all that the Gentile portion of the populace persecuted the Jews before the emperor himself had begun to oppress them (Philo, *adv. Flaccum*). In Vespasian's time the Alexandrians besieged the emperor with petitions to get him to deprive their Jewish fellow-citizens of their rights (*Antt.* xii. 3. 1). In Antioch it got the length of bloodshed in Vespasian's time (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3), while Titus again was asked to expel the Jews from the city altogether, and if he could not see his way to do this, then to deprive them of their rights at least (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 5. 2; *Antt.* xii. 3. 1). In Asia Minor the municipal towns were always making fresh attempts to prevent the Jews from practising their own worship, which was precisely the reason that the Roman edicts of toleration became necessary (*Antt.* xii. 3. 2, xvi. 2. 3–5, and in general the edicts given in *Antt.* xiv. 10 and xvi. 6). The same thing also took place in Cyrene (*Antt.* xvi. 6. 1 and 5). In Caesarea it often got the length of sanguinary encounters between Gentiles and Jews (*Antt.* xx. 8. 7, 9; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 13. 7, 14. 4–5, 18. 1). In like manner in towns where Jews did *not* enjoy the rights of citizenship the hatred of the Gentile populace occasionally vented itself upon them in the shape of bloody persecution, as was pre-eminently the case at the outbreak of the Jewish war in Ascalon, Ptolemais, Tyre, Hippos, Gadara (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 18. 5) and Damascus (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2). With regard to *the people of Ascalon*, Philo observes that they had an inveterate dislike to the Jews (Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 30, ed. Mang. ii. 576). Of the Phoenicians it was, according to Josephus, the Tyrians who were specially animated by feelings of hostility toward the Jews (*contra Apion.* i. 13).

[184] *Antt.* xii. 3. 2.

as something quite new, as a boon which the Romans, with their orderly system of government, were the first to create, viz. that everywhere every one was at liberty "to live and worship his own gods." [185]

The more that the attitude of the Romans, with their world-wide power, was on the whole favourable to Judaism, it was of but the greater consequence to the Jews of the dispersion that so many of them possessed the *rights of Roman citizenship*, not only in Rome, but elsewhere as well. According to the testimony of Philo, the majority of the Jews living in Rome enjoyed such rights, and that in the capacity of descendants of freedmen. Of the Jews taken captive in war, and whom Pompey had once brought to Rome and there sold as slaves, many were set free by their own master, and on obtaining their freedom they were at the same time invested with the rights of citizenship, which rights their descendants continued to enjoy ever after.[186] It would even appear that some of those *libertini* must have quitted Rome and gone back to Jerusalem again, where they had founded a community by themselves. For the *Λιβερτῖνοι* mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles (vi. 9) can hardly have been other than Roman freedmen and their descendants.[187] Consequently

[185] *Antt.* xvi. 2. 4 (ed Bekker, vol. iv. p. 6): ἐξεῖναι κατὰ χώραν ἑκάστοις τὰ οἰκεῖα τιμῶσιν ἄγειν καὶ διαζῆν.

[186] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 sq.): Ῥωμαῖοι δὲ ἦσαν οἱ πλείους ἀπελευθερωθέντες. Αἰχμάλωτοι γὰρ ἀχθέντες εἰς Ἰταλίαν ὑπὸ τῶν κτησαμένων ἠλευθερώθησαν, οὐδὲν τῶν πατρίων παραχαράξαι βιασθέντες . . . Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν (*scil.* Augustus) οὔτε ἐξῴκισε τῆς Ῥώμης ἐκείνους, οὔτε τὴν Ῥωμαϊκὴν αὐτῶν ἀφείλετο πολιτείαν. The act of manumission might take place in different ways. When it was performed in the formal solemn fashion the slave received along with his freedom the rights of Roman citizenship. See Rein in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 1026 ff. (art. "Libertini").

[187] A *libertinus* is either the son of a freedman or a freedman himself (see Rein as above). But the community at Jerusalem founded by such *libertini* seems to have still retained its designation of *συναγωγὴ Λιβερτίνων* among the later generations as well. Comp. in general the commentaries on Acts vi. 9 (the matter being treated with great detail for example in

there would be Jews living in Jerusalem too who possessed the rights of Roman citizenship. But we also find such in large numbers elsewhere, and above all in Asia Minor.[188] Hence there is nothing at all strange in the circumstance that the Apostle Paul, a native of Tarsus in Cilicia, was found to be in the enjoyment of the rights of Roman citizenship (Acts xvi. 37 sqq., xxii. 25–29, xxiii. 27).[189] It is true we have no means of knowing how the Jews of Asia Minor attained to this position.[190] But the fact itself is all the less open to question, that it is well known otherwise that as early as the first century B.C. there were many thousands of Roman citizens living in Asia Minor.[191] The *advantages* that accompanied the

Jo. Chrph. Wolf's *Curae phil. in Nov. Test.* i. 1090–93, with a list of the earlier literature ; also Deyling, *Observationes Sacrae*, ii. 437–444), and the Bible lexicons of Winer, Schenkel and Riehm under "Libertiner."

[188] So in Ephesus (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 13, 16, 19), Sardes (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 17), Delos (*Antt.* xiv. 10. 14), and generally, *Antt.* xiv. 10. 18.

[189] Doubts as to Paul's enjoyment of such rights have been raised for example by Renan (*Paulus*, chap. xiii. of German edition 1869, p. 442) and Overbeck (*Erklärung der Apostelgesch.* pp. 266 sq., 429 sq.). But the reasons advanced in support of those doubts appear to me much too weak in presence of the fact that it is precisely in the most trustworthy portions of the Acts that the matter is vouched for.

[190] For a conjecture as to this see Mendelssohn in *Acta soc. philol.*, Lips. v. 174–176. On the various ways generally in which the rights of Roman citizenship might be acquired, see Rein, art. "Civitas," in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* ii. 392 sqq. Winer, *Realwörth.* i. 200, art. "Bürgerrecht." On the special question as to how Paul became a Roman citizen, see the literature given in Wolf's *Curae phil. in Nov. Test.*, note on Acts xxii. 28. De Wette, *Einl. in das N. T.* § 119b. Credner, *Einl. in das N. T.* p. 288 sq. Winer's *Realwörtb.* i. 200, ii. 212. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften N. T.'s*, § 58. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 61 sqq. Wold. Schmidt in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* 2nd ed. xi. 357.

[191] There is the well-known fact of the massacre perpetrated by *Mithridates*, who in the year 88 B.C. ordered all the Roman citizens in Asia Minor to be put to death with their wives and children (see the passages for example in Kuhn, *Die städtische und bürgerl. Verfassung des röm. Reichs*, i. 25). Valerius Maximus estimates the number of the massacred at 80,000 (Valer. Max. ix. 2, *extern.* iii.: Tam hercule quam Mithridatem regem, qui una epistola lxxx. civium Romanorum in Asia per urbes negotiandi gratia dispersa interemit). Of course here it would seem to be natives of Italy

possession of the rights of Roman citizenship were very considerable. For those living in the provinces it was of consequence above all that a Roman was subject only to the jurisdiction of Roman courts, the civil causes being disposed of by a jury composed of Roman citizens,[192] and those of a criminal character by the Roman procurator or governor. It was only in the *civitates*, recognised as *liberae*, that the Roman citizens as well were subject to the jurisdiction of other than Roman authorities.[193] Of the various privileges[194] the following may be further mentioned as worthy of special note: (1) Exemption from every kind of degrading punishment, such for example as scourging and crucifixion;[195] and (2) the *jus provocationis* or *appellationis*, both which phrases were used synonymously in the imperial age, and were employed to denote the right of appealing against any sentence to the emperor himself. This right held good in the case of civil as well as criminal causes.[196] We must beware of confounding with this appeal against a sentence *already pronounced* the claim that might be put in at the very commencement of the process to have the whole matter referred to the emperor in Rome. According to the usual though

that are in question. But we find scarcely forty years after this that the number of Roman citizens in Asia Minor was so large that the consul Lentulus was able in the year 49 B.C. to raise as many as two legions of them (Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* iii. 4; for the passage, see note 144, above). Certainly in this instance it can hardly be only natives of Italy that are in view.

[192] Rudorff, *Römische Rechtsgeschichte*, ii. 13.

[193] Kuhn, *Die städtische und burgerl. Verfassung des römischen Reichs*, ii. 24. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 75 sq.

[194] On these see Rein, art. "Civitas," in Pauly's *Encycl.* ii. 392 sqq. Winer, *Realwörtb.* i. 200, art. "Bürgerrecht," and the literature quoted by both.

[195] See Acts xvi. 37 sqq., xxii. 25 sqq., and Pauly's *Real-Enc.* under "Crux," "Lex Porcia" and "Lex Sempronia."

[196] See Rein in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* under "Appellatio" and "Provocatio." Geib, *Geschichte des römischen Criminalprocesses* (1842), p. 675 sqq.

not altogether indisputable view, Roman citizens charged with capital offences were also at liberty to urge this claim.[197]

In many Hellenistic cities the Jews, in virtue of their possessing the rights of citizenship, were on a level with the rest of the inhabitants. Of course in those communes they failed on an average to attain to a leading position. We should rather say that, as we have already seen, it was precisely this possessing of the rights of citizenship that led to the hostility and persecution to which they were so often exposed. At the same time there were many places, Egypt in particular, where at certain periods Jews also have been found to play a *prominent part in public life*. The first of the Ptolemies were on the whole favourably disposed toward them.[198] Under some of the later Ptolemies again very important appointments were entrusted to them. Ptolemy VI. (Philopater) and his consort Cleopatra "committed the care of their entire kingdom to the hands of Jews, while it was the Jewish generals Onias and Dositheus that had command of the whole army."[199] Another Cleopatra, the daughter of the two royal personages just mentioned, when carrying on war against her son Ptolemy Lathurus, also appointed two Jewish generals, Chelkias and Ananias, to the

[197] Acts xxv. 10 sqq., 21, xxvi. 32. Pliny, *Epist.* x. 96 (*al.* 97): Fuerunt alii similis amentiae, quos quia cives Romani erant adnotavi in urbem remittendos. Geib, *Gesch. des röm. Criminalprocesses*, p. 251. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 383 sqq. (who however confounds the claim put in by Paul with the *appellatio* proper). Overbeck, *Erklärung der Apostelgesch.* p. 429 sq. Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, ii. 1 (1874), p. 245. That Roman citizens could *insist* on the procedure in question as a *right* is not perfectly certain. See, on the other hand, a monograph of Ruprechts just published.

[198] Joseph. *Apion.* ii. 4.

[199] *Apion.* ii. 5: Ὁ δὲ Φιλομήτωρ Πτολεμαῖος καὶ ἡ γυνὴ αὐτοῦ Κλεοπάτρα τὴν βασιλείαν ὅλην τὴν ἑαυτῶν Ἰουδαίοις ἐπιστεύσαν, καὶ στρατηγοὶ πάσης τῆς δυνάμεως ἦσαν Ὀνίας καὶ Δοσίθεος Ἰουδαῖοι.

chief command of her army.[200] Likewise in the Roman period many wealthy Jews were still found to be playing a prominent part in public life in Alexandria. In particular we happen to know that the office of *alabarch*, probably chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile, was repeatedly held by wealthy Jews, as for example by Alexander the brother of Philo the Philosopher, and later on by a certain person called Demetrius.[201] With reference to this Josephus informs us that the Romans had allowed the Jews of Alexandria "to retain the responsible position that had been entrusted to them by the kings, namely the duty of watching

[200] *Antt.* xiii. 10. 4, xiii. 1–2. Chelkias and Ananias were sons of the high priest Onias IV., who built the temple at Leontopolis.

[201] Alexander the brother of Philo, *Antt.* xviii. 6. 3, 8. 1, xix. 5. 1, xx. 5. 2. Demetrius, *Antt.* xx. 7. 3. On the office of alabarch, comp. my article in the *Zeitschr. für wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, pp. 13–40, where the earlier literature is also given. Since that was written there fall to be added to the list, Grätz, *Die jüdischen Ethnarchen oder Alabarchen in Alexandria* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1876, pp. 209 sqq., 241 sqq., 308 sqq.), who, while in essential points accepting my results, has nevertheless overlaid them with all manner of confusions. As the two alabarchs mentioned by Josephus happen to have been wealthy Jews, many have supposed the alabarch to have been the president of the whole Jewish community in Alexandria, and have therefore identified him with the Jewish ethnarch. But there is not the slightest warrant for this. I rather incline to think that I have shown to a demonstration that the ἀλαβάρχης (*Edict. Just.* xi. 2–3; Palladas, *Anthol. graec.*, ed. Jacobs, vol. iii. p. 121; *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4267; a coin in Mionnet's *Description de médailles antiques, Suppl.* vol. vi. p. 379) is identical with the ἀραβάρχης (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 4751, 5075; *Cod. Just.* iv. 61. 9; Cicero, *ad Atticum*, ii. 17; Juvenal, i. 130), and is the designation given to the chief collector of customs on the Arabian side of the Nile. See in particular *Cod. Just.* iv. 61. 9 (edict of the Emperors Gratian, Valentinian and Theodosius): Usurpationem totius licentiae summovemus circa vectigal Arabarchiae per Aegyptum atque Augustamnicam constitutum, nihilque super transductionem animalium, quae sine praebitione solita minime permittenda est, temeritate per licentiam vindicari concedimus. The only difficulty in the way is that with regard to the inscription 4267 of *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* found in Lycia; and the coin of Teos (which I have not taken account of in my article). But in both instances the title may have been imported from Egypt.

the river."[202] There was a distinguished Alexandrian Jew of the name of Tiberius Alexander, a son of Alexander the alabarch just mentioned, who even rose to some of the highest positions in the Roman army, though at the sacrifice of the religion of his fathers.[203] No doubt the Jews had grown to be an influential element in society even in Rome itself. But here they never succeeded in gaining the position they had attained in Egypt, the contrast between the Roman and Jewish natures being too strong and abrupt for that.[204]

### 4. *Their Religious Life.*

The constant contact of the Judaism of the dispersion with Gentile culture could not fail to influence its internal development as well. Above all, in those places where, from their wealth and social standing, the Jews were in a position to avail themselves of the educative agencies of their time—as in Alexandria in particular — did the Judaism of the dispersion follow a direction essentially different from that of Palestine. In the dispersion the cultured Jew was not only a Jew, but a Greek as well, alike in respect of language,

[202] *Apion.* ii. 5, *fin.*: Maximam vero eis fidem olim a regibus datam conservare voluerunt, id est fluminis custodiam totiusque custodiae, nequaquam his rebus indignos esse judicantes. The words *totiusque custodiae* are in any case a corruption. Perhaps instead of *custodiae* (=φυλακῆς) we should read θαλάσσης. By *custodia* we are naturally to understand the watching with a view to the collecting of the customs. Comp. Caesar, *Bell. Alexandr.* c. xiii.: Erant omnibus ostiis Nili custodiae exigendi portorii causa dispositae. Naves veteres erant in occultis regiae navalibus, quibus multis annis ad navigandum non erant usi.

[203] *Antt.* xx. 5. 2: τοῖς γὰρ πατρίοις οὐκ ἐνέμειναν οὗτος ἔθεσιν. On Tiberius Alexander, comp. § 19, above.

[204] Perhaps we may be allowed only further to add, that among the Jews who were crucified by Florus in Jerusalem in the year 66 A.D. there were also some who held the *rank of Roman knighthood* (*Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 9). Their execution is justly described by Josephus as a serious violation of their rights.

education, and habits, and by the sheer force of circumstances he was impelled to find ways and means of harmonizing and combining Jewish and Hellenistic idiosyncrasies (for more on this point see § 33 and 34). But strictly speaking this can only be said with regard to the more highly educated among them, while even in their case it was always the original Jewish element of their character that predominated. This latter was true, in a still higher degree, of the great mass of the Jewish people. However much those of the dispersion may have adopted the Greek language as their vernacular, however defective and lax their observance of the law might have seemed in the eyes of the Pharisees, however much they may have given up as unimportant what to the Pharisee appeared both essential and necessary, still in the depths of their heart they were Jews notwithstanding, and felt themselves to be in all essential respects in unison with their brethren in Palestine.

One of the principal means employed for preserving and upholding the faith of their fathers among the communities of the dispersion was the regular meetings for worship in the *synagogues* on the Sabbath. There cannot be a doubt that in the dispersion as well those meetings took place wherever an organized community of Jews was found to exist. We learn from Philo that "in all the towns thousands of houses of instruction were open where discernment and moderation and skill and justice and all virtues generally were taught."[205] In the course of his travels through Asia Minor and Greece the Apostle Paul everywhere met with Jewish synagogues; as for example in Antioch of Pisidia (Acts xiii. 14), Iconium (Acts xiv. 1), Ephesus (xviii. 19, 26, xix. 8), Thessalonica (xvii. 1), Berea (xvii. 10), Athens (xvii. 17), Corinth (xviii. 4, 7). Josephus mentions synagogues as being

[205] Philo, *De septenario*, c. vi. (Mang. ii. 282=Tischendorf, *Philonea*, p. 23). For the passage itself, see note 113, § 27, above.

in Caesarea and Dora on the Phoenician coast.[206] Jewish *προσευχαί* are met with even upon inscriptions in the Crimea.[207] Then in those towns in which the Jews were rather more numerous there were several synagogues. This was so in the case of Damascus (Acts ix. 20), of Salamis in Cyprus (Acts xiii. 5), while in Alexandria there was quite a multitude of them.[208] Josephus singles out as being particularly elegant the synagogue at Antioch (*i.e.* the chief synagogue there, for in any case there was a considerable number of them in that town as well). To this latter the successors of Antiochus Epiphanes had presented the sacred vessels of brass (and these alone, not the valuable gold and silver ones) which Antiochus had carried off from the temple at Jerusalem, while the Jews of Antioch themselves were at the expense of providing cups of a more valuable kind in order still more to enhance the beauty of their sanctuary (*τὸ ἱερόν*).[209] In Rome there was a large number of synagogues as early as the time of Augustus, as Philo testifies throughout his works generally. Further, the names of the various synagogal communities have been handed down to us through the medium of the inscriptions.[210] Consequently wherever Jews were found to be living, there the law and the prophets were read and expounded every Sabbath and the religious ordinances observed. *The language employed in public worship was, as a rule, undoubtedly the Greek.*[211] The truth is Hebrew was so little current among

[206] Caesarea, *Bell. Jud.* ii. 14. 4–5. Dora, *Antt.* xix. 6. 3.

[207] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* vol. ii. p. 1004 sq. *Addenda*, n. 2114[b], 2114[bb].

[208] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 20 (Mang. ii. 565): *πολλαὶ δὲ εἰσι καθ' ἕκαστον τιμῆμα τῆς πόλεως.*

[209] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3.

[210] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 sq.). For the passage itself, see note 133, above. On the various names of the synagogal communities of Rome, see above, p. 247 sq.

[211] On this and as partly *pro* and partly *contra*, comp. Lightfoot, *Horae hebr. in Epis. I. ad Corinthios*, *Addenda ad Cap.* xiv. (*Opp.* ii. 933–940; he questions the use of the Septuagint in the public services). Hody, *De*

the Jews of the dispersion that not a single instance has been met with of its use upon a tombstone. At all events the inscriptions in the Roman catacombs (dating from the first centuries of our era) are composed almost exclusively in Greek or Latin (the latter less frequently), or at most with short postscripts in Hebrew. It is not till we come down to the epitaphs of Venosa (dating from somewhere about the sixth century of our era) that we see how Hebrew begins to come gradually into use.[212] But among these too it is Greek or Latin that is still most frequently met with. If even for such monumental purposes Hebrew was not in use, then much less likely is it to have been so in the oral addresses at the meetings for public worship. The Rabbinical authorities in Palestine have expressly sanctioned the use of any language whatever in repeating the Shemah, the Shemoneh Esreh, and the grace at meals; while it is only in the case of the priestly benediction, and a few special passages of Scripture, such as the formula repeated in connection with the offering of the firstlings and with the chaliza that the use of Hebrew is absolutely insisted upon.[213] A certain R. Levi bar Chaitha once heard the Shemah repeated in Greek (אליניכתין) in Caesarea.[214] Then the *writing* of the Holy Scriptures in Greek is expressly sanctioned, while here too, as before, it is only in the case of several passages composed for certain specific purposes, such as the tephillin and mesusoth, that the

*Bibliorum textibus originalibus*, pp. 224–228 (in answer to Lightfoot). Diodati, *De Christo graece loquente* (Neapoli 1767), pp. 108–110. Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, i. § 253. Frankel, *Vorstudien zu der Septuaginta*, p. 56 sqq. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. p. 269 sq.

[212] This is a circumstance to which Askoli in particular (*Inscrizioni inedite*, 1880) has drawn attention. Comp. my review in the *Theol. Litztg.* 1880, p. 485 sq.

[213] *Mishna Sota*, vii. 1. 2. Comp. vol. i. p. 10.

[214] *Jer. Sota*, vii. fol. 21b. See the passage for example in Buxtorf's *Lex. Chald.* col. 104 (under אליכתין). Lightfoot, *Opp.* ii. 937. Levy *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* i. 88.

use of Hebrew is insisted on.[215] If therefore, in oral address or written compositions, the use of Hebrew was obligatory only in the case of certain passages, then one should say that, according to the Rabbinical view, it must also have been considered legitimate to read the Scriptures at the meetings for public worship in some other language, say in Greek. But several of the Fathers have distinctly assured us that, as matter of fact, it was the Greek translation of the Bible that was used in the synagogues, and therefore during public worship.[216] At the same time it is quite possible that on such occasions the Scriptures were read in Hebrew as well as in Greek, as was subsequently the case in the time of the Emperor Justinian.[217] But if we reflect how the Apostle Paul for example was familiar only with the Greek translation of the Old Testament,[218] we can hardly suppose it probable that

[215] *Megilla* i. 8: "Between the Holy Scriptures and the tephillin or mesusoth the only difference is this, that the former may be written in any language, whereas the tephillin and mesusoth must be written in Assyrian (אשורית, *i.e.* in Hebrew square characters). Rabban Simon ben Gamaliel says: likewise the Holy Scriptures are allowed to be written only in Greek."

[216] Justin. *Apolog.* i. 31: ἔμειναν αἱ βίβλοι καὶ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο, καὶ πανταχοῦ παρὰ πᾶσίν εἰσιν Ἰουδαίοις, οἳ καὶ ἀναγινώσκοντες οὐ συνιᾶσι τὰ εἰρημένα. Comp. also *Dial. c. Tryph.* c. lxxii. Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. xviii.: Hodie apud Serapeum Ptolemaei bibliothecae cum ipsis Hebraicis litteris exhibentur. Sed et Judaei palam lectitant. Vectigalis libertas; vulgo aditur sabbatis omnibus. Pseudo-Justin. *Cohort. ad Graec.* (third century A.D.) c. xiii.: Εἰ δέ τις Φάκοι . . . μὴ ἡμῖν τὰς βίβλους ταύτας ἀλλὰ Ἰουδαίοις προσήκειν, διὰ τὸ ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἐν ταῖς συναγωγαῖς αὐτῶν σώζεσθαι κ.τ.λ. *Ibid.*: ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων συναγωγῆς ταύτας ἀξιοῦμεν προκομίζεσθαι. In all those passages the *Greek* translation of the Old Testament is expressly referred to. On the keeping of the Holy Scriptures in safe custody in the synagogues, see above, p. 74 sq.

[217] Justinian, *Novell.* cxlvi., where the emperor states in the preamble that he has heard ὡς οἱ μὲν μόνης ἔχονται τῆς ἑβραΐδος Φωνῆς καὶ αὐτῇ κεχρῆσθαι περὶ τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν βιβλίων ἀνάγνωσιν βούλονται, οἱ δὲ καὶ τὴν Ἑλληνίδα προσλαμβάνειν ἀξιοῦσι, καὶ πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον ὑπὲρ τούτου πρὸς σΦᾶς αὐτοὺς στασιάζουσιν.

[218] This has been demonstrated by Kautzsch, *De Veteris Testamenti locis a Paulo apostolo allegatis*, Lips. 1869.

there was any such simultaneous use of both the Hebrew and the Greek text.

Considering how rigidly Jewish worship was centralized in Jerusalem, the existence of *the Jewish temple at Leontopolis* cannot but strike us as a somewhat remarkable phenomenon. In the time of Antiochus V. Eupater (164–162 B.C.), Onias IV., the son of the high priest Onias III., finding that there was no prospect of his succeeding to the high-priesthood in Palestine, came to Egypt where he was cordially welcomed by Ptolemy VI. Philometer and his consort Cleopatra. The king placed at his disposal in Leontopolis in the province of Heliopolis a dilapidated temple which had previously been dedicated to the *ἀγρία Βούβαστις*.[219] This ruin Onias proceeded to

[219] The locality is most minutely defined in *Antt.* xiii. 3. 2: *τὸ ἐν Λεοντοπόλει τοῦ Ἡλιοπολίτ ν ἱερὸν συμπεπτωκός . . . προσαγορευόμενον δὲ τῆς ἀγρίας Βουβάστεως*. A similar precise fixing of the spot may be found in what is said *Antt.* xiii. 3. 1. Everywhere else Josephus merely mentions in a general way that the temple stood "in the *province of Heliopolis*" (*Antt.* xii. 9. 7, xiii. 10. 4, xx. 10; *Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 1, vii. 10. 3). In *one* passage only is it further added that the place on which it stood was 180 stadia from Memphis (*Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 3). Now as we know from other sources that Leontopolis formed a province of itself lying more to the north than Heliopolis (Strabo, xvii. 1. 19, p. 802; Pliny, v. 9. 49; Ptolemaeus, iv. 5. 51), it follows that the Leontopolis here spoken of must be another one otherwise unknown to us and lying in the province of Heliopolis. As affording a clue towards a precise identifying of the spot, the following facts may be subjoined. Memphis stood on the southern point of the Delta. To the north of it some 24 miles off and on the eastern side of the Delta lay Heliopolis (see *Itinerar. Antonini*, ed. Parthey et Pinder, 1848, p. 73). The distance as here stated corresponds pretty closely with the 180 stadia=22½ miles given by Josephus. But the *Itinerarium Antonini* again mentions a place called *Vicus Judaeorum* at a distance of 22+12=34 miles to the north-east of Heliopolis (*Itinerar. Antonini*, ed. Parthey et Pinder, p. 75; the distances as given at p. 73 are somewhat greater; on the situation of the place, see Menke, *Atlas antiquus*, map xxx.). One is tempted to identify the place here in question with the site of Onias' temple, for it may easily enough have belonged to the province of Heliopolis; besides this identification is further favoured by the circumstance of the province of Bubastus being near by. But as this *Vicus Judaeorum* was as far as 24+34=58 miles (therefore 464 stadia) from Memphis, we are bound to assume that Josephus must have been expressing himself in

rebuild, and transformed it into a Jewish sanctuary after the model of the temple in Jerusalem, though smaller and plainer and with numerous deviations in regard to details. Now as there also happened to be a sufficient number of priests already at hand a regular Jewish temple service was at once instituted, a service which continued without interruption from that date (therefore from somewhere about 160 B.C.) till the destruction of Jerusalem, after which, like its prototype, it was closed by the Romans (73 A.D.).[220] Of course the learned doctors of Palestine

very vague terms, and that his 180 stadia were not meant to represent the distance between Memphis and the temple of Onias, but merely that between Memphis and the capital of the province of Heliopolis (the passage as it occurs in *Bell. Jud.* vii. 10. 3 runs thus: δίδωσιν αὐτῷ χώραν ἑκατὸν ἐπὶ τοῖς ὀγδοήκοντα σταδίους ἀπέχουσαν Μέμφεως· νομὸς δ' οὗτος Ἡλιουπολίτης καλεῖται). The "land of Onias" (ἡ Ὀνίου λεγομένη χώρα), which was inhabited by Jews, is likewise mentioned in *Antt.* xiv. 8. 1 = *Bell. Jud.* i. 9. 4, and that as lying between Pelusium and Memphis, which accords with the foregoing statements. Different from this again is the "so-called camp of the Jews," τὸ καλούμενον Ἰουδαίων στρατόπεδον, *Antt.* xiv. 8. 2 = *Bell. Jud.* i. 9. 4, on the other side of the Delta and to the north-west of Memphis (the army of Mithridates and Antipater in hastening to the assistance of Caesar marched from Pelusium through the "land of Onias" on to Memphis and thence round the Delta to the "Jews' camp"). Lastly, in the *Notitia Dignitatum Orientis*, chap. xxv. (ed. Böcking, i. 69), a *Castra Judaeorum* is mentioned as being in the province of Augustamnica. Now as Augustamnica is the land to the east of the Delta (see my article on the alabarchs in the *Zeitschr. f. wissenschaftl. Theol.* 1875, pp. 26–28), this *Castra Judaeorum* must therefore be identical with the *Vicus Judaeorum*. Comp. in general, Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iv. 354 (article "Judaeorum Vicus"), where however the *Judaeorum Vicus* is erroneously represented as standing to the south-east instead of to the north-east of Heliopolis.

[220] See in general, Joseph. *Antt.* xii. 9. 7, xiii. 3. 1–3, 10. 4. xx. 10; *Bell. Jud.* i. 1. 1, vii. 10. 2–4. Cassel, *De templo Oniae Heliopolitano*, Brem. 1730 (also in *Dissertationum variorum de antiquitatibus sacris et profanis fasciculus novus*, ed. Schlaeger, 1743, pp. 1–48). Herzfeld, iii. pp. 460 sqq., 557–564. Jost, i. pp. 116–120. Grätz, iii. 3rd ed. p. 33 sq. Ewald, iv. p. 462 sqq. Wieseler, *Chronol. des apostol. Zeitalters*, p. 498 sqq. *Untersuchung über den Hebräerbrief*, ii. 75 sqq. *Stud. u. Krit.* 1867, p. 665 sqq. Frankel, *Einiges zur Forschung über den Onias-Tempel* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1851–52, pp. 273–277). Jastrow, *Einiges über den Hohenpriester Onias IV. in Aegypten und die Gründung des tempels zu Heliopolis* (*Monatsschr.* 1872, pp. 150–155). Lucius, *Der Essenismus*, pp.

never looked upon the services of this temple as legitimate worship, nor did they recognise the sacrifices offered in it as valid except to a very limited extent.[221] But even the Egyptian Jews themselves were not satisfied merely with the worship in their adopted country, but still kept up their connection with Jerusalem. In common with all other Jews they made pilgrimages to Jerusalem,[222] while their priests on getting married always had their wife's pedigree authenticated in the Holy City.[223]

In common with the law generally, the prescriptions regarding the temple tribute and the pilgrimages to Jerusalem on festival occasions were as far as possible complied with by the Jews of the dispersion. This was particularly the case with respect to the *tribute*. Apropos of the plundering of the temple by Crassus, Josephus remarks that it was not to be wondered at that such a large amount of treasure should have accumulated there, for from an early date

82–86. Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 488. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* part ii. art. "Oniastempel."

[221] Mishna, *Menachoth* xiii. 10: "When any one vows to offer a burnt-offering, he must offer it in the temple. If he did so in the temple of Onias he would not fulfil his duty. If he said: I wish to offer it in the temple of Onias, he is bound nevertheless to offer it in the temple. But if he did so in the temple of Onias, still he would fulfil his duty. R. Simon says that would not be in the least a burnt-offering. If any one vows to be a Nazarite he must shave off his hair in the temple, and if he were to do it in the temple of Onias he would not be fulfilling his duty. If he made the vow on the condition that the shaving of the hair was to take place in the temple of Onias, he is nevertheless bound to have it done in that temple. But if he did it in the temple of Onias it would be sufficient. R. Simon: he would not be a Nazarite. The priests who have ministered in the temple of Onias are not at liberty to minister in the temple at Jerusalem. . . . They are like those with some bodily defect; they get their portions and partake of the offerings, but they are not to be allowed to sacrifice." In the common printed text the name of *Onias* is written חוניו (*Chonjo*). Two of the best authorities, *cod. de Rossi* 138, and the Cambridge manuscript edited by Lowe, 1883, uniformly read instead נחוניו (*Nechonjon*).

[222] Philo, *De providentia*, quoted by Euseb. in *Praep. evang.* viii. 16. 64, ed. Gaisford (= Philonis *Opp.* ed. Mang. ii. 646); and in Armenian in Aucher's *Philonis Judaei sermones tres*, p. 116.

[223] *Apion.* i. 7.

every Jew and every proselyte throughout the world, in Europe and Asia alike, had been paying tribute to the temple.[224] Philo gives us the following details as to the way in which the temple tribute was collected and remitted to Jerusalem:[225] "The revenue of the temple is derived not merely from a few lands, but from other and much more copious sources which can never be destroyed. Because as long as the human race endures so long will the sources of the temple revenue continue to exist, seeing that they will last as long as the world itself. For it is prescribed that every Jew who is over twenty years of age is to pay so much tribute annually. . . . But as might be expected in the case of so numerous a people, the amount thus contributed is very large. In almost *every town there is an office for the collection of the sacred funds and into which the tribute is paid. Then at particular seasons these funds are entrusted to men of good standing whose duty it is to convey them to Jerusalem.* For this purpose it is always those of the highest rank that are chosen, as a kind of guarantee that that which is every Israelite's hope may reach the Holy City untampered with." That the withdrawal of those sums from the Roman provinces was frequently objected to we have already had occasion to mention. Flaccus for example had ordered the sums thus collected in Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum to be confiscated. From the time of Caesar onwards however the withdrawal of this money has everywhere been sanctioned, even from Rome itself[226] no less than from Asia Minor[227] and

[224] *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2: Θαυμάσῃ δὲ μηδεὶς εἰ τοσοῦτος ἦν πλοῦτος ἐν τῷ ἡμετέρῳ ἱερῷ, πάντων τῶν κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην Ἰουδαίων καὶ σεβομένων τὸν θεόν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀσίας καὶ τῆς Εὐρώπης εἰς αὐτὸ συμφερόντων ἐκ πολλῶν πάνυ χρόνων. On the question as to *what* items of tribute had to be paid by the Jews of the dispersion, see vol. i. p. 247.

[225] Philo, *De monarchia*, book ii. § 3 (Mang. ii. 224).

[226] Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 23 (Mang. ii. 568 sq.).

[227] *Antt.* xvi. 6. 2, 3, 4, 6, 7. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 40 (Mang. ii. 592).

Cyrenaica,[228] and of course from Egypt also, as we have seen from the words of Philo already quoted. But there was no quarter from which the money poured in so abundantly as from Babylon and the districts beyond the Euphrates. Here the system of collecting and remitting was of a thoroughly organized kind. The head offices into which in the first instance the tribute (namely *τό τε δίδραχμον . . . καὶ ὁπόσα ἄλλα ἀναθήματα*) was paid were in the two cities of Nisibis and Nehardea. Then at a particular date they were conveyed from these places to Jerusalem, many thousands of people being entrusted with this task so as to secure the sacred treasury against the attacks of the Parthian bandits.[229] After the destruction of the temple the sacred tribute had necessarily to undergo at least some modification or other. The didrachmon was converted into a Roman tax, while the other items of tribute could from the nature of the case be no longer payable (comp. § 24, notes 95 and 109). But even in the altered state of things the Jews continued to evince their internal union by imposing a voluntary tax upon themselves. A new central authority, viz. the patriarchate, was created, and to this a portion at least of the sacred tribute required by their law was handed over year by year. Under this new arrangement the money was collected by individuals sent out by the patriarchate for the purpose, viz. the so-called *apostoli* (see above, p. 269).

But there was nothing that contributed so much to cement the bond of union between the dispersion and the mother country as the regular pilgrimages which Jews from all quarters of the world were in the habit of making to Jerusalem on festival occasions. "Many thousands of people from many thousands of towns made pilgrimages to the

[228] *Antt.* xvi. 6. 5.

[229] *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1. Comp. Philo, *Legat. ad Cajum*, § 31 (Mang. ii. 578). *Shekalim* iii. 4 (the didrachmae tax from Babylon and Media).

temple at every festival, some by land, some by sea, and coming from the east and the west, from the north and the south."[230] The number of Jews that were usually assembled in Jerusalem at the time of the feasts has been estimated by Josephus at as high a figure as 2,700,000, the inhabitants of Jerusalem being of course included.[231]

### 5. *The Proselytes.*

As forming an essential element in the physiognomy of the Judaism of the dispersion, we must also mention that numerous body of adherents who in every quarter joined themselves to the Jewish communities and were known under the designation of *proselytes.*

On a mere cursory glance it seems strange that Jewish propagandism should have been at all crowned with anything like success among Gentile populations, for *the feeling on the part of the Graeco-Roman world toward the Jews* was by no means of a sympathetic character. We have already seen how, in the Hellenistic towns, the Jews were everywhere regarded with disfavour, how not only the mass of the people but the authorities themselves made repeated attempts to interfere with them in the free observance of their own religion (see above, pp. 260 sq., 275 sq.). Again, the *opinions*

[230] Philo, *De monarchia*, book ii. § 1 (Mang. ii. 223): Μυρίοι γὰρ ἀπὸ μυρίων ὅσων πόλεων οἱ μὲν διὰ γῆς, οἱ δὲ διὰ θαλάττης, ἐξ ἀνατολῆς καὶ δύσεως καὶ ἄρκτου καὶ μεσημβρίας, καθ' ἑκάστην ἑορτὴν εἰς τὸ ἱερὸν καταίρουσιν. On the pilgrimages from Babylon, comp. besides the passage already quoted, viz. *Antt.* xviii. 9. 1, also *Antt.* xvii. 2. 2. Mishna, *Joma* vi. 4; *Taanith* i. 3.

[231] *Bell. Jud.* vi. 9. 3. Comp. Grätz on this in the *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1871, pp. 200–207. The passage in Acts ii. 9–11 does not apply here, for according to ii. 5 it is not the festival pilgrims that are in view there, but foreign Jews who had their stated residence in Jerusalem.

*expressed regarding them in Greek and Roman literature* are for the most part of a highly disparaging kind.[232] By the majority of the educated people of that time the Jewish religion was looked upon as a *barbara superstitio*.[233] Men did not hesitate to believe and circulate against them the most ridiculous and most abominable stories, stories that had been hatched above all by the literati of Alexandria. Many of the wretched allegations in question were of course due only to ignorance and not to malevolence. It was so for example when some inferred from the appellation *Judaei* that they belonged originally to Crete and derived their name from Mount Ida,[234] or when others, in consequence of the famous golden vine in

[232] On this comp. Meier (Fr. Carol), *Judaica seu veterum scriptorum profanorum de rebus Judaicis fragmenta*, Jenae 1832. Schmitthenner (Chr. J.), *De rebus Judaicis quaecunque prodiderunt ethnici scriptores Graeci et Latini*, Weilburg 1844. Gieseler, *Kirchengesch.* (4th ed.) i. 1. 50–52. Winer, *Realwörth.* i. 638 sq., note. Müller (J. G.), *Kritische Untersuchung der taciteischen Berichte über den Ursprung der Juden*, Hist. v. 2 sqq. (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1843, pp. 893–958). Frankel, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenthums*, 1856, pp. 81–94. *Ibid.* 1860, pp. 125–142. Giles, *Heathen Records to the Jewish Scripture History; containing all the extracts from the Greek and Latin writers in which the Jews and Christians are named*, London 1856. Goldschmidt, *De Judaeorum apud Romanos condicione*, Halis Sax. 1866. Gösser, *Die Berichte des classischen Alterthums über die Religion der Juden* (*Tüb. Theol. Quartalschr.* 1868, pp. 565–637). Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. i. pp. 149–156, iii. pp. 383-392. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. 1871, pp. 513–515. Scheuffgen, *Unde Romanorum de Judaeis opiniones conflatae sint*, Köln 1870, Program for the Rheinische Ritter-Akademie of Bedburg. Gill, *Notices of the Jews and their Country by the classic writers of antiquity*, 2nd ed. London 1872. Geiger (Ludov.), *Quid de Judaeorum moribus atque institutis scriptoribus Romanis persuasum fuerit*, Berol. 1872. Grätz, *Ursprung der zwei Verlaumdungen gegen das Judenthum vom Eselskultus und von der Lieblosigkeit gegen Andersgläubige* (*Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1872, pp. 193–206). Rösch, *Caput asininum* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1882, pp. 523–544). Schuhl, *Les préventions des Romains contre la religion juive*, Paris 1883, Durlacher. Hild, *Les juifs à Rome devant l'opinion et dans la littérature* (*Revue des études juives*, vol. viii. 1884, pp. 1–37, and sequel).

[233] Cicero, *Pro Flacco*, chap. xxviii.

[234] Tacit. *Hist.* v. 2.

the temple[235] and certain observances at the feast of Tabernacles, were betrayed into supposing that they worshipped Bacchus, a view about which there is a somewhat protracted discussion in Plutarch,[236] while Tacitus scouts it by simply remarking that: Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Judaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque.[237] But the majority of the things alleged against the Jews were wicked slanders which for the most part owed their origin to the prolific soil of Alexandria. We find that the exodus from Egypt above all had, in the course of time, been worked up into a complete romance. The foundation of this had been already laid by Manetho (or an interpolator), and, after being further developed by the Alexandrian literati Chäremon, Lysimachus, Apion, it was taken up by Tacitus and Justin and retailed with sundry alterations and additions.[238] The substance of this story is that a number of persons suffering from leprosy had been expelled from the country by an Egyptian king—sometimes called Amenophis and sometimes Bocchoris—and sent to the stone quarries or into the wilderness. Among them there happened to be a priest of Heliopolis of the name of *Moses* (whose real name, according to Manetho, was *Osarsiph*). This Moses prevailed upon the lepers to renounce the worship of the gods of Egypt and to adopt a new religion which he offered them. Under his leadership they then quitted the country, and after many vicissitudes and the perpetration of numerous disgraceful acts they reached the district around Jerusalem, which they proceeded to subdue and take permanent possession of. To the various incidents with which this exodus was accompanied, Tacitus has no

[235] Mishna, *Middoth* iii. 8. Joseph. *Antt.* xv. 11. 3; *Bell. Jud.* v. 5. 4. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

[236] Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 5.

[237] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

[238] Manetho in Joseph. *contra Apion.* i. 26; Chäremon, *ibid.* i. 32; Apion, *ibid.* ii. 2. Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 3. Justin, xxxvi. 2. For more on the literary history, see below, § 33.

difficulty in tracing the origin of pretty nearly all the habits and usages of the Jews, whether of those that are real or of those that are only imputed. Apion the grammarian had already maintained that the Jews were in the habit of paying divine honours to an ass's head.[239] Tacitus retails this as though he believed it to be true (notwithstanding the fact that immediately after he alludes to the absence of images in connection with their worship), and attributes it to the circumstance that, while in the wilderness, the Jews were indebted to a herd of wild asses for drawing their attention to some copious springs of water.[240] The abstinence from the use of swine's flesh he accounts for by the fact that this animal is peculiarly liable to the itch, therefore to that very disease on account of which the Jews were once so severely maltreated. The frequent fasting is alleged to have been by way of commemorating the starvation from which they suffered during their journey through the wilderness. The use of unleavened bread, again, is supposed to be an evidence of the fact of their having stolen corn at the time of the exodus. And lastly, it is assumed that their observance of the seventh day of the week is due to the circumstance that this was the day on which their toils came to an end, and that, as they found it so pleasant to have nothing to do, they also consecrated the seventh year to idleness.[241]

[239] Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 7.

[240] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 3–4. On the ass-worship, comp. further Damocritus in Suida's *Lex.* under Δαμόκριτος (Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 377). Tertullian, *Apologet.* c. xvi.; *ad nationes*, i. 11. Minucius Felix, *Octav.* c. ix. Rösch, *Caput asininum* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1882, p. 523 sqq.), and the literature quoted there.

[241] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 4: Sue se abstinent merito cladis, qua ipsos scabies quondam turpaverat, cui id animal obnoxium. Longam olim famen crebris adhuc jejuniis fatentur; et raptarum frugum argumentum panis Judaicus nullo fermento detinetur. Septimo die otium placuisse ferunt, quia, is finem laborum tulerit; dein blandiente inertia septimum quoque annum ignaviae datum.

There were three things in particular which the educated world of the time made the butt of its jeers, viz. the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh, the strict observance of the Sabbath, and the worship without images. While in Plutarch it is seriously debated whether the abstinence from the use of swine's flesh may not be due to the fact of divine honours being paid to this animal,[242] Juvenal again jokes about the land where "the clemency of the days of old has accorded to pigs the privilege of living to a good old age," and where "swine's flesh is as much valued as that of man." Then as for the observance of the Sabbath, the satirist can see nothing in it but indolence and sloth, while he looks upon Jewish worship as being merely an adoring of the clouds and the skies.[243] It would appear again that contemporaries with a philosophical training had, in like manner, no appreciation whatever of the worshipping of God in spirit. It was not merely the literary swashbucklers of Alexandria who delighted in urging against the Jews the charge of refusing to worship the native divinities and the emperors,[244] but we even find a man like Tacitus observing with singular coolness and not without a touch of censure, that:[245] Judaei menti sola unumque numen intelligunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant; summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interiturum. Igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio non Caesaribus honor. And lastly, Pliny speaks of the Jews as a gens contumelia numinum insignis.[246]

[242] Plutarch, *Sympos.* iv. 5.

[243] Juvenal, *Sat.* vi. 160: Et vetus indulget senibus clementia porcis.
*Ibid.* xiv. 98: Nec distare putant humana carne suillam.
*Ibid.* xiv. 105–106: Sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
Ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam.
*Ibid.* xiv. 97: Nil praeter nubes et caeli numen adorant.

[244] Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 6.

[245] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5

[246] Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* xiii. 4–46.

But there was nothing that did so much to awaken the dislike of the Graeco-Roman world as that wall of rigid separation which the Jew had erected between himself and all the rest of mankind. And just at a time when the world-wide rule of the Romans and the levelling influences of Hellenism were pulling down more and more the ancient barriers that separated nation from nation, it must have been felt to be doubly annoying that the Jews should be the only people who insisted on holding aloof from this process of universal amalgamation. Apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnes alios hostile odium, says Tacitus;[247] while Juvenal alleges against them, and not altogether without reason, that if asked to show the way to any place they always refused to do so except to those of their own faith, and that if any one happened to be looking for a well they would not take him to it unless he had been circumcised.[248] When it was commonly alleged in Alexandria that the Jews had taken an oath never to show kindness to a stranger (Gentile),[249] or that they even went the length of offering a Greek in sacrifice every year,[250] these were no doubt ridiculous slanders. But still there is an element of truth underlying the statement of Tacitus, in which he

[247] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5.

[248] Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 103–104:

> Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
> Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.

[249] Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 10.

[250] Joseph. *contra Apion.* ii. 8. Comp. also Damocritus in Suidas' *Lex.* under Δαμόκριτος (Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 377). J. G. Müller, *Des Flavius Josephus Schrift gegen Apion* (1877), p. 263 sqq. As is well known, similar charges (as for example that the Jews murdered people who were not of their own faith to use their blood for sacrificial purposes) continue to be alleged against them down to the present day. Christians were also charged with holding Θυέστεια δεῖπνα (circular of the churches of Lyons and Vienne, quoted by Euseb. *H. E.* v. 1. 14. Athenagoras, *Suppl.* c. iii. Justin. Martyr. *Apol.* ii. 12. Minucius Felix, *Octav.* c. ix. Tertullian, *Apolog.* c. viii.; *ad nationes*, i. 7. Origen, *contra Cels.* vi. 27).

affirms that the first things Jewish proselytes are taught to do are to despise the gods, to repudiate their nationality, and to disparage parents, children and brothers.[251] The truth is, it was just this that formed the bright as well as the dark side of Judaism, the fact namely that, as a religious community, it maintained its exclusiveness with such uncompromising rigour.

The feelings cherished toward the Jews throughout the entire Graeco-Roman world were not so much those of hatred as of pure contempt. The prevailing tone that runs through the whole estimate of Judaism, as given by Tacitus, is that of the profoundest contempt, the contempt of the proud Roman for this despectissima pars servientium, for this teterrima gens.[252] Those feelings have found their bitterest expression in the words of Marcus Aurelius as recorded by Ammianus Marcellinus: Ille enim cum Palaestinam transiret Aegyptum petens, Judaeorum faetentium et tumultantium saepe taedio percitus dolenter dicitur exclamasse: O Marcomanni, O Quadi, O Sarmatae, tandem alios vobis inertiores inveni.[253]

It may be asked, and that not without reason, how it was possible, if such were the feelings of the Graeco-Roman world, that *Jewish propagandism should have met with any success* at all. *In order to understand this, three things must be borne in mind.* (1) In the course of their missionary efforts the Jews to all appearance understood above all things how to present Judaism in a form calculated to recommend it even to a Greek or a Roman. They took care to keep in the background, as not being of the nature of an essential, whatever was certain at first to appear odd or to have a repelling effect, while they laid most stress upon those points in regard to which they felt they could reckon on a sympathetic appreciation of them in

[251] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 5: Contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes, liberos, fratres vilia habere.

[252] Tacitus, *Hist.* v. 8.

[253] Ammian. Marcellin. xxii. 5.

the case of many at least; this they did above all with respect to their idea of God. Judaism is the truly rational religion, rejecting as it does the notion of a multiplicity of gods with circumscribed spheres of action, and worshipping the one Lord and Creator of all things and Him only, even that Almighty and righteous God who is omnipotent, and who recompenses every one strictly according to his moral conduct. Nor, like a shortsighted heathenism, does it represent the Divine Being in the finite form of a man or even of an animal, but it rejects every material representation of Him, and makes the invisible Lord of heaven and earth, who rules over all and who transcends all the limits of the material world, the sole object of its worship. That it was upon these points that the greatest stress was laid, and that it was in this form that, in the first instance, Judaism was presented by the Hellenistic Jews to their Gentile fellow-citizens, is what any one may be convinced of who will only give a cursory glance at the writings of Philo and the Jewish Sibylline books. Those people (the Jews) are proudly conscious that they are the truly enlightened ones of the earth, who, as regards religious matters at least, rank highest in the scale of civilisation. And it was surely impossible that such a consciousness should not ultimately produce its due effect. Hence one can understand how Strabo for example should be found to speak of *Moses* with a certain degree of sympathy; for the Jewish source—whether written or oral—on which his narrative is based, has obviously presented the Jewish legislator to him in the light of a genuine Stoic philosopher. Moses taught, he informs us, "that the Egyptians had erred in making the divinity to resemble animals; that such a thing was not done by the Libyans, nor even by the Greeks, who represented Him under a human form. For that alone is God which embraces us all as well as the earth and the sea, which we name heaven, and world, and the nature of things (εἴη γὰρ ἓν τοῦτο μόνον θεὸς

τὸ περιέχον ἡμᾶς ἅπαντας καὶ γῆν καὶ θάλατταν, ὃ καλοῦμεν οὐρανὸν καὶ κόσμον καὶ τὴν τῶν ὄντων φύσιν). But what man in his senses would venture to make an image of that, an image only resembling something around us? Rather must the making of images be given up altogether, and a worthy temple being consecrated to Him, let Him be worshipped without any image whatever.[254] It is true that for all that Strabo did not become a Jew, for he knew too well that the Jewish religion had subsequently deteriorated owing to so many superstitious elements having been mixed up with it.[255] But if Jewish apologists now knew, as they did, how to give a profounder meaning and import even to those "superstitious" elements, may it not be that many a one felt himself attracted by them? (2) A further circumstance which was well calculated to win adherents to Judaism was the fact that the Jewish religion aimed at the practical realization of a moral and happy life. Strictly speaking, there was no religion from which such an aim could be said to be entirely absent. But in the case of Judaism it assumed a much more definite, more complete, and more satisfactory form than in any of the ancient heathen religions. The Greek and Roman gods could help their worshippers neither to a truly moral nor to a truly happy life. Now Judaism, through its sacrifices and purifications, its complicated system of religious prescriptions and the promise given to those who observed them, held out the certain prospect of both those things. And if deliverance from sin and sorrow be the deepest longing of the human heart, is it possible that a religion which seemed to afford a more certain prospect of such deliverance than those of heathendom could pretend to do, could fail to have its attractions even in spite of the seeming repulsiveness of many of its externals? (3) Lastly, it was also an advantage to Judaism as well, that it happened to be so much the

[254] Strabo, xvi. 2. 35, p. 760 sq. [255] Strabo, xvi. 2. 37, p. 761.

fashion of the time to patronize Oriental religions generally. The religions of classical antiquity no longer exercised the same absolute power of attracting the minds of men as once they did. On all hands people were itching for something new, and they eagerly clutched at those mysterious Oriental worships which, owing to increased intercourse and more extended commercial relations, were every day becoming more widely known.[256] We find that in Greece, and more particularly in Athens, the Phrygian worships of Sabazius (Bacchus) and the great mother of the gods had got a footing even at so early a period as the end of the fifth century B.C.[257] The Egyptian and other Oriental ones followed not long after. In the year 333 B.C. the Athenians issued a decree giving permission to the merchants from Citium (Cyprus) to build a temple to Aphrodite, therefore to the Semitic Astarte, in the Piraeus; while on this occasion reference is made to the fact that the Egyptians already had a temple of Isis in the same place.[258] This latter therefore must have been built about the middle of the fourth century B.C. A century farther on, viz. about 250 B.C., we also find a collegium of worshippers

[256] On this and the state of religious matters throughout the Graeco-Roman world generally, comp. Tzschirner, *Der Fall des Heidenthums* (Leipzig 1829), pp. 18–164, especially p. 74 sqq. Döllinger, *Heidenthum und Judenthum. Vorhalle zur Geschichte des Christenthums*, Regensb. 1857. Schneckenburger, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, pp. 4–61. Hausrath, *Neutestamentliche Zeitgeschichte*, 2nd ed. ii. 1–85. Friedländer, *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, iii. 1871, pp. 421–544. Keim, *Rom und das Christenthum* (from Keim's unpublished remains, and edited by Ziegler, Berlin 1881), pp. 1–171, especially p. 83 sqq. Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, Paris 1878. Bouché-Leclercq, *Les religions romaines dans l'Asie Mineure*, 2 vols., 2nd ed. Paris 1878. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 1878, pp. 71–112. Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 3rd ed. by Jordan, vol. ii. 1883, pp. 760–773. A considerable amount of material may be found in the Indices to the *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*

[257] See in particular, Foucart, *Des associations religieuses chez les Grecs*, chap. ix. x. and xi.

[258] Foucart, pp. 187–189 = *Corp. Inscr. Atticarum*, ii. 1, n. 168: κατὰ τὰ πάτρια καὶ οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι τὸ τῆς Ἴσιδος ἱερὸν ἵδρυνται.

of Serapis (*Σαραπιασταί*) in the Piraeus.[259] In the last-mentioned case it is obvious that the association is now no longer composed merely of foreigners, but, as the Greek names of the members serve to show, of natives as well. And so we find that since the third century B.C. Egyptian cults had come to be very widely practised throughout Greece generally.[260] Besides these, other Oriental worships, and that in strange admixture, are also to be met with particularly in the islands of Greece and in Asia Minor.[261] In Rome again it was in like manner the Egyptian worships above all that, at an early period, gained a firm footing.[262] Even so far back as the second century B.C. they had begun to make their appearance here, and although repeatedly forbidden by the senate and put down by force, still they always sprang up afresh. In the year 43 B.C. the triumvirs themselves built a temple of Serapis and Isis for public worship.[263] Consequently by this time the worship of the gods of Egypt must have been no longer an affair merely of private associations, but carried on under the auspices of the state itself. In the time of Augustus there were already several temples in Rome for the Egyptian sacra, though of course outside the pomaerium as

[259] *Corp. Inscr. Graec.* n. 120 = Foucart, p. 207 = *Corp. Inscr. Attic.* ii. 1, n. 617.

[260] See Preller, *Ueber Inschriften aus Chäronea* (Transactions of the *Sächs. Gesellsch. der Wissensch.* 1854, p. 195 sqq.). Lafaye, *Histoire du culte des divinités d'Alexandrie Sérapis, Isis, Harpocrate et Anubis hors de l'Egypte depuis les origines jusqu' à la naissance de l'école néo-platonicienne*, Paris 1884 (especially pp. 1–38). Comp. in general also Matthiä, art. "Isis," in Ersch and Gruber's *Allg. Encyc.* sec. ii. vol. xxiv. (1845), pp. 427–435. Georgii in Pauly's *Real-Enc.* iii. 1509 sqq. (art. "Horus"), and iv. pp. 276–300 (art. "Isis").

[261] Foucart, chaps. xi. xii. xiii.

[262] See Reichel, *De Isidis apud Romanos cultu*, Berol. 1849. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 76 sqq. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd ed. by Jordan), ii. pp. 373–385. Lafaye, as above, pp. 38–63, and elsewhere. The inscriptions of the city of Rome in *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. vi. n. 344–355 (Isis), and n. 570–574 (Serapis).

[263] Dio Cass. xlvii. 15.

yet.[264] In the reign of Tiberius an attempt was made to suppress them entirely.[265] But many of the succeeding emperors only favoured them so much the more. During the whole imperial age they were disseminated to an unusual degree throughout the provinces especially. At a somewhat later period the Egyptian worships were followed by those of Asia Minor, Syria, and Persia, which also found a footing in Rome. Here their palmy days did not begin till the second century of our era. The worship of the Syrian sun-god was the one to which the Antonines showed special favour.[266] But that of the Persian Mithras, with its dark mysteries, was in still greater favour, and that throughout the entire Roman Empire. Upon the inscriptions in almost every province of the empire there is no Oriental worship that we so frequently meet with in imperial times as this.[267] The secret of the attraction which all those worships possessed lay essentially *in two characteristic features common to them all.*[268] In the first place, in all of them there is a touch of monotheism in some form or other. No matter whether the divinity was known under the designation of Isis, or Serapis, or Mithras, or any other, there was, as a rule, bound up with this designation

[264] Dio Cass. liii. 2.

[265] Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 4. Tacitus, *Annal.* ii. 85. Sueton. *Tiber* xxxvi.

[266] On the Syrian worships, comp. Preller, *Römische Mythologie* (3rd ed.), ii. 394 ff. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 82.

[267] On the Persian Mithras himself, comp. Windischmann, *Mithra, ein Beitrag zur Mythengeschichte des Orients* (*Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, vol. i., Leipzig 1859). On the spread of his worship throughout the Roman Empire, see Zoega, *Ueber die den Dienst des Mithras betreffenden römischen Kunstdenkmäler* (Zoega's *Abhandlungen*, edited by Welcker, 1817, pp. 89–210 and 394–416). Preller, *Römische Mythologie*, 3rd ed. ii. 408–418. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, iii. 82 sqq. Renan, *Marc-Aurèle* (1882), pp. 575–580. T. Fabri, *De Mithrae dei solis invicti apud Romanos cultu, Dissert. inaug.* 1883. For the inscriptions of the city of Rome, see *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* vol. vi. n. 713–754.

[268] On this comp. briefly Marquardt, iii. 84 sqq., for example.

—at least at the time now in question—the idea now more and now less plainly indicated, that this supreme divine being had no equal, nay that the different names were but different designations for one and the same God. The other characteristic feature was the practical tendency connected with that putting away of sin and that moral purity which, though only in the form it might be of an external, often an absurd asceticism, were, in the case of almost the whole of those worships, demanded of those who embraced them, and in return for which they had the promise of deliverance from sin and misery. But in those two leading features it is impossible not to recognise an actual superiority of the Oriental cults over those of the rest of antiquity. For however absurd and repugnant their mode of expressing it might be, they nevertheless answered to a genuine religious need in laying, as they did, the chief stress upon those two points. Now it may be confidently affirmed that Judaism answered this need in a much more perfect manner. If so, where was the wonder that even this *teterrima gens* should yet have found so many who were prepared to embrace its religion? The results in this respect would doubtless have been much more favourable still, if the despised social position of the Jews, and the somewhat non-aesthetic character of the worship, and the load of oppressive and seemingly meaningless and nonsensical ceremonies and observances, had not proved a formidable obstacle. In the Hellenistico-Roman period *Jewish propagandism* seems to have been carried on with great activity. One should have thought that, strictly speaking, orthodox Pharisaic Judaism could hardly have been justified in making any effort whatever to obtain converts to the religion of Israel beyond the circle of its own countrymen. For if it be true that the promise applied only to the children of Abraham, then what, in that case, were the Gentiles to gain by their conversion to the Jewish faith? But here the natural

impulse—so characteristic of all active religionists—to impart to others the blessings which they themselves possess, proved too powerful for dogmatic preconceptions. If by his conversion to Judaism the Gentile would not acquire all the privileges of the true Israelite, still he would thereby be snatched from the mass of those doomed to perdition, and have some connection at least with the people of the promise. Consequently we find that even the Pharisees in Palestine developed an active zeal for conversions. "They compassed sea and land to make *one* proselyte" (Matt. xxiii. 15). Matters however were in a totally different position in the dispersion. For Hellenistic Judaism descent from Abraham was, as may be seen from Philo, only a secondary matter after all, while the true worship of God was regarded as of paramount importance. Here then the desire to convert heathendom from its blindness and folly would of necessity assert itself far more strongly than in Palestine. And hence it is that a portion of the Judaeo-Hellenistic literature is essentially devoted to the promotion of this object (see § 33). How active they were in their labours is sufficiently proved by the way in which Horace satirizes the proselytizing zeal of the Jews.[269]

The success with which those efforts were crowned was in any case something very considerable.[270] If we may judge

[269] Horace, *Sat.* i. 4. 142–143: ac veluti te Judaei cogemus in hanc concedere turbam. Comp. Danz, *Cura Judaeorum in conquirendis proselytis, ad Matt.* xxiii. 15 (Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, 1736, pp. 649–676). Wetstein, *Nov. Test.*, note on Matt. xxiii. 15, and the commentators generally on this passage. For the erroneous interpretation of it given by Grätz, see *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1869, p. 169 sq. The historical truth of the thing assumed in Matt. xxiii. 15 is also maintained by Kuenen (*Volksreligion und Weltreligion*, German translation, 1883, pp. 332–334).

[270] On the proselytism of the Jews, comp. Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 407–411. Selden, *De synedriis*, lib. i. c. iii., lib. ii. c. iii. Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 31–52 of the notes (and at p. 51 sqq. of the

from the numerous hints we come across, it may be assumed that, in the Hellenistico-Roman period, the number of those who allied themselves more or less closely with the Jewish communities, took part in Jewish worship, and observed the Jewish ordinances with a greater or less degree of strictness, was a very large one, although not quite equal to that of the worshippers of Isis and Mithras. "Many of the Greeks," as Josephus boasts, "have been converted to the observance of our laws; some have remained true, while others, who were incapable of stedfastness, have fallen away again."[270a] "Likewise among the mass of the people," he remarks in another passage, "there has for a long time now been a great amount of zeal for our worship; nor is there a single town among Greeks or barbarians or anywhere else, not a single nation to which the observance of the Sabbath as it exists among ourselves

same, the older literature). Deyling, *De σεβομενοις του θεου* (*Observatt. sacr.* ii. pp. 462–469). Various dissertations in Ugolini's *Thesaurus*, vol. xxii. Lübkert, *Die Proselyten der Juden* (*Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, pp. 681–700). Winer, *Realwörtb.* ii. 285–287. Leyrer, art. "Proselyten," in Herzog's *Real-Encyc.*, 1st ed. xii. 237–250. In the second edition and re-written by Delitzsch, xii. 293–300. De Wette, *Lehrb. der bibl. Archäologie* (4th ed.), pp. 374–377. Keil, *Handb. der bibl. Archäologie* (2nd ed.), pp. 339–342. Zezschwitz, *System der christl. kirchl. Katechetik*, vol. i. (1863), pp. 210–227. Holtzmann in Weber and Holtzmann's *Gesch. des Volkes Israel*, ii. 268 sqq. Hausrath, *Zeitgesch.* 2nd ed. ii. 111–123. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, pp. 220–229. Grünebaum, *Die Fremden nach rabbinischen Gesetzen* (Geiger's *Jüd. Zeitschr. für Wissensch. und Leben*, 1870, pp. 43–57; 1871, pp. 164–172). Steiner in Schenkel's *Bibellex.* iv. pp. 629–631. Bernay's *Die Gottesfürchtigen bei Juvenal* (*Commentationes philol. in honorem Th. Mommseni*, 1877, pp. 563–569; also in Bernay's *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 1885, ii. pp. 71–80). Reuss, *Gesch. der heil. Schriften A. T.'s*, § 557. Hamburger, *Real-Encyc. für Bibel und Talmud*, 2nd part, art. "Proselyt;" also the articles "Nichtisraelit," "Noachiden," "Helene," "Izates," "Monobaz." Grätz, *Die jüdischen Proselyten im Römerreiche unter den Kaisern Domitian, Nerva, Trajan und Hadrian* (*Jahresbericht des jüd.-theol. Seminares zu Breslau*, 1883). Kuenen, *Volksreligion und Weltreligion* (German edition, 1883), pp. 224–227.

[270a] *Apion.* ii. 10: *πολλοὶ παρ' αὐτῶν εἰς τοὺς ἡμετέρους νόμους συνέβησαν εἰσιλθεῖν, καὶ τινὲς μὲν ἔμειναν, εἰσὶ δ' οἳ τὴν καρτερίαν οὐχ ὑπομείναντες πάλιν ἀπέστησαν.*

has not penetrated; while fasting and the burning of lights, and many of our laws with regard to meats, are also observed." [271]

[271] *Apion.* ii. 39: καὶ πλήθεσιν ἤδη πολὺς ζῆλος γέγονεν ἐκ μακροῦ τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας, οὐδ' ἔστιν οὐ πόλις Ἑλλήνων οὐδ' ἠτισοῦν οὐδὲ βάρβαρος, οὐδὲ ἓν ἔθνος, ἔνθα μὴ τὸ τῆς ἑβδομάδος, ἣν ἀργοῦμεν ἡμεῖς, ἔθος οὐ διαπεφοίτηκε, καὶ αἱ νηστεῖαι καὶ λύχνων ἀνακαύσεις καὶ πολλὰ τῶν εἰς βρῶσιν ἡμῖν οὐ νενομισμένων παρατετήρηται. Comp. Tertullian, *ad nationes*, i. 13: Vos certe estis, qui etiam in laterculum septem dierum solem recepistis, et ex diebus ipso priorem praelegistis, quo die lavacrum subtrahatis aut in vesperam differatis, aut otium et prandium curetis. Quod quidem facitis exorbitantes et ipsi a vestris ad alienas religiones. Judaei enim festi sabbata et coena pura et Judaici ritus lucernarum et jejunia cum azymis et orationes litorales, quae utique aliena sunt a diis vestris. No doubt Tertullian is here speaking only of Gentiles who observed certain Jewish practices. So in the case of Josephus one has an impression that he also has in view the observance of Jewish practices outside the circle of the Jewish communities. He aims at showing how the laws of the Jews found an echo even among those who were not Jews themselves. In proof of this he first of all mentions the fact that the Greek philosophers had drawn largely upon those laws; and then he proceeds to point out in the way already stated how the observance of Jewish practices was often to be met with among the mass of the people as well. Still it appears to me to be plain that here it is not mere analogies between Gentile and Jewish practices that the historian has in view (such practices as the adopting of the week of seven days and the Orphico-Pythagorean asceticism). For what Josephus also finds among those who are not Jews is precisely the *Jewish* manner of observing the Sabbath as well as the observance of the *Jewish* regulations with respect to meats. But it is the reference to the practice of *burning lights* (λύχνων ἀνακαύσεις, *ritus lucernarum*, as Tertullian calls it) that shows above all that the matter in question is an actual imitating of Jewish practices. For the practice in view is obviously that of burning lights before the dawn of the Sabbath, so that in the course of that day there may be no occasion to violate the law against the lighting of the fire on the Sabbath (Ex. xxxv. 3). Comp. on this "Sabbath-light" (נֵר הַשַּׁבָּת), Mishna, *Shabbath* ii. 6, 7. Vitringa, *De synagoga vetere*, pp. 194–199 (*ibid.* also at p. 1123, where the passage from *Shabbath* xxxv. is given). Seneca, *Epist.* xcv. 47 (ed. Haase): Quomodo sint di colendi, solet praecipi: accendere aliquem lucernas sabbatis prohibeamus, etc. The matter is described with great pungency by the satirist *Persius*, who says (*Sat.* v. 179–184): "But when the days of Herod come round (*i.e.* the Jewish Sabbaths observed by Herod), and the lamps placed in the greasy window emit their thick smoke (unctaque fenestra ‖ dispositae pinguem nebulam vomucre lucernae), and in the red plate the tail of a tunny-fish swims, and the white jug overflows with wine, then thou silently movest the lips and

Seneca[272] and Dio Cassius[273] bear testimony to precisely the same effect, though from a different standpoint. For the purpose of accounting for the large amount of treasure in the temple at Jerusalem, Josephus appeals not merely to the copious tribute sent in by Jews in every part of the world, but also to that contributed by the "God-fearing," *i.e.* the proselytes.[274] In stating the number of Jews of every nationality that were living in Jerusalem, the Acts (ii. 9–11) does not forget to mention the proselytes along with the Jews (ii. 10: *Ἰουδαῖοί τε καὶ προσήλυτοι*). And we find that those general testimonies are corroborated by numerous details of one kind or another. In Antioch "the Jews always got a large number of Greeks to come to their religious services when they treated them as, in a certain sense, a part of themselves."[275] In Antioch of Pisidia Paul addressed those assembled in the synagogue as: *ἄνδρες*

turnest pale at the Sabbaths of the circumcised." Josephus is therefore to be understood as speaking of the observance of practices of a specifically Jewish character by those who were not native Jews; and in doing so he distinguishes between those people who have a "zeal for our religion" (*ζῆλος τῆς ἡμετέρας εὐσεβείας*) and the philosophers who, while borrowing a great deal from Moses, nevertheless "to all appearance continue to adhere to their native practices" (*τῷ δοκεῖν τὰ πάτρια διεφύλαττον*). *Consequently he has in view those who have consciously adopted Jewish practices as such.* Certainly he does not appear to regard them as belonging to the number of those who had joined the Jewish communities; and besides, Tertullian speaks of those who thoughtlessly adopted only one or two of the Jewish practices. From this then we can see that the line of demarcation was somewhat ill defined.

[272] Seneca as quoted by Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, vi. 11: Cum interim usque eo sceleratissimae gentis consuetudo convaluit, ut per omnes jam terras recepta sit, victi victoribus leges dederunt. . . . Illi tamen causas ritus sui noverunt; major pars populi facit, quod cur faciat ignorat.

[273] Dio Cass. xxxvii. 17: *Ἥ τε γὰρ χώρα Ἰουδαία καὶ αὐτοὶ Ἰουδαῖοι ὠνομάσθησαν. Ἡ δὲ ἐπίκλησις αὕτη ἐκείνοις μὲν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅθεν ἤρξατο γενέσθαι, φέρει δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ἄλλους ἀνθρώπους ὅσοι τὰ νόμιμα αὐτῶν, καίπερ ἀλλοεθνεῖς ὄντες, ζηλοῦσι.*

[274] *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2.

[275] *Bell. Jud.* vii. 3. 3: *αἰεί τε προσαγόμενοι ταῖς θρησκείαις πολὺ πολῆθος Ἑλλήνων κἀκείνους τρόπῳ τινὶ μοῖραν αὑτῶν πεποίηντο.*

Ἰσραηλεῖται καὶ οἱ φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts xiii. 16), ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί, υἱοὶ γένους Ἀβραὰμ καὶ οἱ ἐν ὑμῖν φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν (Acts xiii. 26). After the service was concluded there followed him πολλοὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ τῶν σεβομένων προσηλύτων (Acts xiii. 43; comp. also xiii. 50). In Thessalonica there was converted by Paul τῶν σεβομένων Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος πολύ (Acts xvii. 4). In Athens Paul preaches in the synagogue τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καὶ τοῖς σεβομένοις (Acts xvii. 17). Consequently we find that wherever there was a Jewish community there was also a body of proselytes attached to it. That in Rome too Jewish propagandism must have been attended with some measure of success, is evident from the satires of a Horace or a Juvenal.[276] Then, as in the case of every religious movement, so also in the case of Jewish propagandism, it was found that it was the female heart that was most impressionable. In Damascus nearly the whole female portion of the inhabitants was devoted to Judaism.[277] And not unfrequently it was precisely women of rank who showed those leanings.[278] We also read of at least several instances of the conversion of men occupying distinguished positions.[279] But the most notable triumph of the proselytiz-

[276] Horace, *Sat.* i. 9. 68–72 (where the person who observes the Jewish Sabbath is described as *unus multorum*). Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96–106. A certain Beturia Paulina . . . quae bixit an. LXXXVI. meses VI. proselita an. XVI. nominae Sara is mentioned upon a Roman inscription in Orelli's *Inscr. Lat.* n. 2522. Again, the Φλαβία Ἀντωνῖνα γυνὴ Δατίβου τοῦ ζὰ βίου ἀπὸ τῆς συναγωγῆς τῶν Αὐγουστησίων, mentioned on another Roman epitaph (*Corp. Inscr. Graec.* 9903=Fiorelli, *Catalogo del Museo di Napoli*, *Inscr. Lat.* n. 1960), was certainly not a native Jewess. Comp. in general, Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. 274 sq.

[277] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 20. 2.

[278] Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 4. Joseph. *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5. In this latter passage we read of how, on one occasion, a couple of Jewish swindlers defrauded a Roman lady of rank and a devotee of Judaism of a large sum of money under the pretext of sending it to the temple in Jerusalem. On the Empress Poppaea, see above, p. 238.

[279] Acts viii. 26 sqq. (the treasurer of Queen Candace). Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 7. 1, 3 (Azizus of Emesa and Polemon of Cilicia, both of them brothers-in-

ing zeal of the Jews was the conversion of the royal house of Adiabene, to which Josephus recurs again and again with manifest pride (*Antt.* xx. 2–4; *Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 2, iv. 9. 11, v. 2. 2, 3. 3, 4. 2, 6. 1, vi. 6. 3, 4).[280] The kingdom of Adiabene, situated on the confines of the Roman and Parthian Empires, and standing towards the latter in a certain relation of dependence, was in the time of Claudius under the rule of a monarch called Izates, who, with his mother Helena, became a convert to Judaism, and subsequently induced his brother Monobazus and all the rest of his kindred to follow his example.[281] Owing to its conversion this family came to have

law of Agrippa II.). Only as being an analogous case we may here mention the consul Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla, for it is probable that it was Christianity to which they were converted and not Judaism. On this see Dio Cass. lxvii. 14. Sueton. *Domitian.* c. xv.; and on *another* Domitilla, the niece of that same consul Clement, and in regard to whom it is expressly stated that she was a Christian, see Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* iii. 18. 4, 5; Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene, ii. 160, 163, *ad. ann. Abr.* 2112 (where the chronographer Bruttius or Brettius is mentioned as his authority, for whom comp. Müller, *Fragm. hist. graec.* iv. 352). There is further the name of a Domitilla, who probably was also a Christian, on the inscription, n. 948 in vol. vi. of *Corp. Inscr. Lat.* Comp. in general, Volkmar, *Theol. Jahrbücher*, 1856, p. 297 sqq. Zahn, *Der Hirt des Hermas* (1868), p. 44 sqq. Idem, *Zeitschr. für die histor. Theologie*, 1869, p. 627 sqq. Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, iv. 455 sqq. Lipsius, *Chronologie der römischen Bischöfe* (1869), pp. 147–162. Seyerlen, *Entstehung und erste Schicksale der Christengemeinde in Rom* (1874), p. 56 sqq. Caspari, *Quellen zur Geschichte des Taufsymbols*, iii. pp. 282, 293 sqq. De Rossi, *Bullettino di archeologia cristiana*, 1875 (notice of this in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1876, 290 sq.). Harnack, *Clementis Romani epistulae* (2nd ed. 1876), *prolegom.* p. lxii. sq. Erbes, *Jahrbb. für prot. Theol.* 1878, p. 690 sqq. Funk, *Theol. Quartalschr.* 1879, p. 531 sqq. Neubauer, *Beiträge zu einer Gesch. der römischen Christengemeinde in den beiden ersten Jahrhunderten* (Elbing 1880, school programme), pp. 18 sq., 37. Hasenclever, *Christliche Proselyten der höhern Stände im ersten Jahrhundert* (*Jahrbb. für prot. Theol.* 1882, pp. 34 sqq., 230 sqq.). Heuser, art. "Domitilla," in Wetzer and Welte's *Kirchenlex.*, 2nd ed. vol. iii. (1884), p. 1953 sqq.

[280] Comp. also Jost, *Geschichte des Judenthums*, i. 341 sqq. Derenbourg, *Histoire de la Palestine*, p. 223 sqq. Brull, *Jahrbücher für jüdische Gesch. und Literatur*, vol. i. 1874, pp. 58–86. Grätz, *Monatsschr. für Gesch. und Wissensch. des Judenth.* 1877, pp. 241 sqq., 289 sqq. Hamburger, *Real-Encyc. für Bibel und Talmud*, part ii. arts. "Helene," "Izates," "Monobaz."

[281] Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 2–4. Izates is also mentioned by Tacitus, *Annal.*

numerous relations of one kind or another with Jerusalem. Izates sent five of his sons to be educated there.[282] Helena made a pilgrimage thither, and during the famine in the time of Claudius she gave away large quantities of the necessaries of life to be distributed among the people.[283] According to a Rabbinical tradition, she is said to have been a Nazarite for fourteen, or as some others allege, even for twenty-one years.[284] Both Helena and Monobazus (who succeeded his brother as king) had a palace in Jerusalem.[285] They both presented valuable cups to the temple there.[286] When Izates and his mother died, Monobazus caused them to be buried in Jerusalem in a magnificent tomb which had been built by Helena herself.[287] During the Jewish wars some relatives of

xii. 13, 14, as being king of Adiabene in the time of Claudius. Monobazus is mentioned as belonging to Nero's time by Tacitus, *Annal.* xv. 1, 14. Dio Cass. lxii. 20, 23, lxiii. 1. On the later history, see the outline in Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung*, i. 1881, p. 435 sqq.

[282] *Antt.* xx. 3. 4. [283] *Antt.* xx. 2. 6.

[284] *Nasir* iii. 6: "If any one has vowed to be a Nazarite for a longer period and after the time of his vow has expired comes to the land of Israel, then, according to the school of Shammai, he is a Nazarite for thirty days, while according to the school of Hillel, he is so over again from the beginning. Queen Helena, on the occasion of her son's setting out for the war, vowed, saying: If my son comes back safe I will be a Nazarite for seven years. He did come back, and she became a Nazarite for seven years; and not till after the expiry of the seven years did she come to the land of Israel. Then the school of Hillel declared that she was bound to be a Nazarite for still other seven years; and as, at the end of this latter seven years, she was defiled, she was therefore a Nazarite twenty-one years in all. Rabbi Judah says: She was so only fourteen years."

[285] *Bell. Jud.* v. 6. 1, vi. 6. 3. A female relative of Izates' of the name of Grapte also had a palace in Jerusalem, *Bell. Jud.* iv. 9. 11.

[286] *Joma* iii. 10: "King Monobaz (מונבז) caused all the handles of the utensils that were made use of on the great day of atonement to be made of gold. His mother Helena again caused a golden lamp (נברשת, the same word precisely as that used in Dan. v. 5) to be placed over the door of the temple: while she also caused a golden tablet to be made on which was written the passage about the adulterous woman."

[287] *Antt.* xx. 4. 3; *Bell. Jud.* v. 2. 2, 3. 3, 4. 2. The tomb consisted of *three pyramids* (*Antt.* xx. 4. 3). Eusebius, who had seen it himself, speaks of στῆλαι (Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* ii. 12. 3: τῆς γέ τοι Ἑλένης . . . εἰσέτι νῦν στῆλαι

Monobazus fought on the side of the Jews against the Romans.[288]

The form which the adhesion of Gentiles to Judaism assumed, and the extent to which they observed the ceremonial law of

διαφανεῖς ἐν προαστείοις δείκνυνται τῆς νῦν Αἰλίας). It was so famous that Pausanias, *Descr. Graeciae*, viii. 16, compares it with the tomb of Mausolus. The account he gives of it is certainly of a somewhat fabulous character. He says, for instance, that by means of a wonderful piece of mechanism the stone door of the tomb opened of itself at a particular time once in every year, and then closed again in the same way; at any other time it would have been impossible to open it without destroying it altogether. From the passages in *Bell. Jud.* it would appear that the tomb stood to the north of the city, and according to *Antt.* xx. 4. 3, at a distance of three stadia from it. According to Jerome, *Peregrinatio S. Paulae*, c. vi., it stood on the left side (therefore on the east side) of the road to one coming southward (ad laevam musoleo Helenae derelicto . . . ingressa est Hierosolymam). All this renders it highly probable that it is *identical* with *the so-called kings' tombs of the present day*, the largest site of an ancient burying-place to be found in the vicinity of Jerusalem. On this see Robinson's *Palestine*. Idem, *Modern Biblical Researches* (in favour of the identity). Ritter, *Erdkunde*, xvi. 475 sqq. (also in favour of identity). Tobler, *Topographie von Jerusalem*, ii. 276–323 (against the identity). Raoul Rochett, *Revue archéologique*, vol. ix. 1 (1852), pp. 22–37 (in favour of the identity). Quatremère, *ibid.* pp. 92–113, 157–169 (who takes the kings' tombs to be the tomb of Herod). De Saulcy, *Revue archéologique*, vol. ix. 1 (1852), p. 229 sqq., ix. 2 (1853), pp. 398–407. Idem, *Voyage en Terre Sainte* (1865), i. 345–410 (who takes the kings' tombs to be the tombs of the ancient kings of Judah). Creuzer, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1853, p. 913 sqq. Bädeker-Socin, *Palästina* (1875), p. 246 sqq. A strong argument in favour of the identity of the kings' tombs with the tomb of Helena is to be found in the fact that in the former a sarcophagus was discovered by De Saulcy, on which there is an inscription in two lines, the first of which runs thus: צדן מלכתא (the Queen Zaddan), the second thus: צדה מלכתה (the Queen Zadda). The language of both lines is Aramaic, but the character in which the first is written is the genuine Syriac, while that of the second is the square Hebrew character. Now surely this is only to be accounted for by the fact that the Queen Zaddan or Zadda in question, and in any case a Jewish queen, belonged to a Syrian royal house which can have been no other than that of Adiabene. See Renan, *Journal Asiatique*, sixth series, vol. vi. (1865) p. 550 sqq. Chwolson, *Corp. Inscr. Hebraicarum* (1882), col. 72 sq. and facsimile, n. 8. For a representation of the sarcophagus and the inscription, see also De Saulcy, *Voyage en Terre Sainte*, i. pp. 377, 385.

[288] *Bell. Jud.* ii. 19. 2, vi. 6. 4

the Jews, was of a very varied character. Tertullian speaks of Gentiles who, while observing several Jewish ordinances, continued notwithstanding to worship their own deities (see note 271). On the other hand, such of them as submitted to circumcision thereby bound themselves to observe the whole law to its fullest extent (Gal. v. 3: *μαρτύρομαι παντὶ ἀνθρώπῳ περιτεμνομένῳ ὅτι ὀφειλέτης ἐστὶν ὅλον τὸν νόμον ποιῆσαι*). Between those two extremes there would be, as we may well suppose, a manifold series of gradations. There is something very instructive, in this connection, in the fourteenth satire of Juvenal, where the poet enlarges on the thought as to the way in which children are injuriously affected by the evil example of their parents. The bad practices of the former, he tells us, are transmitted to the latter, and that, as a rule, in an intensified form. By way of giving an example of this in the domain of superstition, he mentions the *penchant* for Judaism. If the father spends every seventh day in indolence, and looks upon swine's flesh as being quite as precious as the flesh of man, then not only does the son do the same thing, but he even goes the length of submitting to be circumcised, and despises the Roman laws, and studies and reverently observes the Jewish law that has come down from Moses, and which teaches that they are never to point out the way to any but those of their own faith, nor show any one where to find a well, unless he is circumcised.[289] From this it is plain that there must have been varying degrees of strictness on the part of Gentiles in regard to their observance of

[289] Juvenal, *Sat.* xiv. 96–106:—

> Quidam sortiti metuentem sabbata patrem,
> Nil praeter nubes et coeli numen adorant,
> Nec distare putant humana carne suillam,
> Qua pater obstinuit; mox et praeputia ponunt:
> Romanas autem soliti contemnere leges,
> Judaicum ediscunt et servant ac metuunt jus,
> Tradidit arcano quodcunque volumine Moses:

the Jewish law. For the proselytizing zeal of the Jews had just to content itself with what it could get. It was felt that much had been gained if any one could be so far converted as to worship the only true God, and that without the use of images. As regards the ceremonial law, only certain leading points were insisted on in the first instance. Thus the fourth book of the Sibylline oracles, for example, which was composed about the year 80 of our era, and is in all probability of Jewish origin, contains an address to the Gentiles, in which prominence is given only to the worship of the true God and the belief in a future judgment, while instead of requiring the converted Gentile to be circumcised, all that is asked is a bath of purification.[289a]. The history of the conversion of King Izates is also very instructive. This monarch was himself animated by a burning zeal for the Jewish law, and wanted to be circumcised. But a Jew of the name of Ananias ventured to interpose, and in the most urgent way possible tried to dissuade him. The Jew apprehended some danger to himself if the idea should get abroad that he had been the occasion of the king's being circumcised. Consequently he represented to this latter that he could worship God without being circumcised, provided he simply observed in a general way the ordinances of the Jews, this being of more importance than circumcision. He further pointed out to him that if, in deference to the feelings of his subjects, he were to omit this rite, God would certainly forgive him.[290] Yet for all that Izates insisted on being circumcised; while unques-

> Non monstrare vias eadem nisi sacra colenti,
> Quaesitum ad fontem solos deducere verpos.
> Sed pater in causa, cui septima quaeque fuit lux
> Ignava et partem vitae non attigit ullam.

[289a] *Orac. Sibyll.* iv. 164. On the Jewish origin of this book, consult Badt, *Ursprung, Inhalt und Text des vierten Buches der sibyllinischen Orakel*, 1878, and notice of the same in *Theol. Literaturzeitung*, 1878, p. 358 sq.

[290] Joseph. *Antt.* xx. 2. 5.

tionably the views of the merchant Ananias were not those of an orthodox Jew. But there were evidently many who thought very much as he did in regard to those matters. The result of this was, that *to almost every one of the Jewish communities of the dispersion there was attached a following of "God-fearing" Gentiles* who adopted the Jewish (*i.e.* the monotheistic and imageless) mode of worship, attended the Jewish synagogues, but who, in the observance of the ceremonial law, restricted themselves to certain leading points, and so were regarded as outside the fellowship of the Jewish communities. It is God-fearing Gentiles of this description that are undoubtedly to be understood by the *φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν* or the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* so often mentioned in Josephus, and above all in the Acts of the Apostles.[291] Now if we ask ourselves what those points of the ceremonial law were which these Gentiles observed, we will find them plainly enough indicated in the passages already quoted from Josephus, Juvenal, and Tertullian (see notes 271 and 289). All three agree in this, that it was the Jewish *observance of the Sabbath* and the *prescriptions with regard to meats* that were in most general favour within the circles in question. And those are precisely the two points which Juvenal specially mentions in connection with the father of the son who outdoes his father by becoming a thoroughpaced Jew (*metuentem sabbata patrem*

[291] *Φοβούμενοι τὸν θεόν*, Acts x. 2, 22, xiii. 16, 26. *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*, Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2; Acts xiii. 43, 50, xvi. 14, xvii. 4, xvii. 17, xviii. 7. Here the form of expression varies between the fuller *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν* (Joseph. *Antt.* xiv. 7. 2; Acts xvi. 14, xviii. 7) and the simple *σεβόμενοι* (Acts xiii. 50, xvii. 4, xvii. 17). In one instance we meet with *σεβόμενοι* conjoined with *προσήλυτοι* (Acts xiii. 43). Bernays (*Commentationes philol. in honorem*, Th. Mommseni, p. 565) also compares the inscription, n. 88 in vol. v. 1 of *Corp. Inscr. Lat.*: Aur. Soteriae matri pientissimae religioni(s) judaicae metuenti. The forms of expression in Juvenal (metuentem sabbata . . . Judaicum metuunt jus), which Bernays also quotes in this connection, are however of an essentially different character. See in general, Deyling, *De σεβομενοις τον θεον* (*Observationes sacrae*, ii. 462–469). Philo, *Codex apocryphus Nov. Test.* p. 521. Bernays as above.

. . . *carne suillam qua pater abstinuit*). Then again compliance even with these would sometimes be of a more and sometimes of a less rigid character; it is hardly likely that here any hard and fast line would be observed. *From these φοβούμενοι* or *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν we must now distinguish the* גֵּרִים or *προσήλυτοι, strictly so called.* For with these latter expressions later Judaism meant to designate those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, became completely incorporated with the Jewish people. In the Old Testament, in its Hebrew and Greek form alike, the גֵּרִים or the *προσήλυτοι* exactly correspond to the *μέτοικοι* in the Attic state—that is to say, they are regarded as strangers who have their permanent abode in the land of Israel, but without belonging to the fellowship of Israel (*advenae incolae*). But subsequent usage uniformly employed both terms, and that without further qualification, to denote those Gentiles who, through circumcision and the observance of the law, had been admitted into full religious fellowship with Israel.[292]

[292] In the Mishna גֵּר is used in the sense given to it in the text in the following passages: *Demai* vi. 10; *Shebiith* x. 9; *Challa* iii. 6; *Bikkurim* i. 4–5; *Pesachim* viii. 8; *Shekalim* i. 3, 6, vii. 6; *Kethuboth* ix. 9; *Kiddushin* iv. 1, 6, 7; *Baba kamma* iv. 7, ix. 11; *Baba mezia* iv. 10; *Baba bathra* iii. 3, iv. 9; *Edujoth* v. 2; *Horajoth* i. 4, iii. 8; *Chullin* x. 4; *Kerithoth* ii. 1; *Nidda* vii. 3; *Sabim* ii. 1, 3; *Jadajim* iv. 4. The *feminine* גִּיּוֹרֶת occurs in *Jebamoth* vi. 5, viii. 2, xi. 2; *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2, iv. 3; *Kiddushin* iv. 7; *Baba kamma* v. 4; *Edujoth* v. 6. The use of גֵּר in the sense of a *converted* stranger is so completely established that even a *verb* נִתְגַּיֵּר = "to become a convert," has been formed from it, and occurs in *Pea* iv. 6; *Shebiith* x. 9; *Challa* iii. 6; *Pesachim* viii. 8; *Jebamoth* ii. 8, xi. 2; *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2, iv. 3, ix. 6; *Gittin* ii. 6; *Kiddushin* iii. 5; *Chullin* x. 4; *Bechoroth* viii. 1; *Negaim* vii. 1; *Sabim* ii. 3. The Aramaic form of גֵּר is גִּיּוֹרָא, which also occurs twice in the Septuagint (*γειώρας*, Ex. xii. 19; Isa. xiv. 1), and in Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxxii. (*γηώρας*); Schleusner's Lexicon for the Sept. under *γειώρας*, and Otto's note on Justin as above. In his history of the Jewish war Josephus makes frequent mention of *ὁ τοῦ Γιώρα Σίμων*. For the purpose of denoting the simple metoikos in the Old Testament sense of the word, the Mishna uses an expression which, like the former, is also found already in the Old Testa-

How great the number of those may have been we have no means of knowing. But one cannot be far wrong in estimating it to have been considerably smaller than that of the *σεβομενοι*.

With those two classes, the *σεβόμενοι* on the one hand and the *προσήλυτοι* properly so called on the other, Christian scholars are uniformly in the habit of identifying two categories of an apparently kindred character that are met with in Rabbinical literature. It is quite usual to say (as was also done in the first edition of the present work), that the *σεβόμενοι* correspond to what in Rabbinical language are called "*proselytes of the gate*" (גֵּרֵי הַשַּׁעַר), and the *προσήλυτοι*, on the other hand, to what in the same language are known as "*proselytes of righteousness*" (גֵּרֵי הַצֶּדֶק).[293] In point

ment, viz. גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב. *Baba mezia* v. 6, ix. 12; *Makkoth* ii. 3; *Negaim* iii. 1. *The Greek προσήλυτος has also undergone the same changes of meaning* as גֵּר. In later usage this too is no longer employed, as in the Septuagint, to denote an *advena* in the land of Israel, but a convert to the religion of Israel (a *νομίμοις προσελήλυθὼς τοῖς Ἰουδαϊκοῖς*, *Antt.* xviii. 3. 5). It is so explained by Philo, who attaches to the Old Testament term the meaning current in his own day, when he says, *De monarchia*, i. § 7 (Mang. ii. 219): *τούτους δὲ καλεῖ προσηλύτους ἀπὸ τοῦ προσεληλυθέναι καινῇ καὶ φιλοθέῳ πολιτείᾳ κ.τ.λ.* Comp. also the fragment in the Catenae on Ex. xxii. 19, as quoted by Mang. ii. 677. Suidas' Lex. under the word explains as follows: *οἱ ἐξ ἐθνῶν προσεληλυθότες καὶ κατὰ νόμον ποθήσαντες πολιτεύεσθαι.* In the New Testament, Matt. xxiii. 15; Acts ii. 10, vi. 5, xiii. 43 (in the latter passage however the addition of *σεβόμενοι* precludes us from supposing that circumcised persons are in view). Justin, *Dial. c. Tryph.* chap. cxxii. Irenaeus, iii. 21. 1 (Theodotion and Aquila, *ἀμφότεροι Ἰουδαῖοι προσήλυτοι*). Tertullian, *Adv. Judaeos*, chap. i. Clemens Alexandr. *Quis dives salvetur*, chap. xxviii. (Dindorf, iii. 405). Inscription, n. 2522 in Orelli, *Inscr. Lat.* (see note 276). Another inscription in Engeström, *Om Judarne i Rom* (Upsala 1876), p. 41 sq.: Mannacius sorori Chrusidi dulcissime proselyti. Instead of *προσήλυτος* we also find *ἐπήλυτος* by itself (Philo, *De monarchia*, book i. § 7 (ed. Mang. ii. 219). Barnabae, *Epist.* chap. iii. *fin.*).

[293] So Deyling, for example, in the treatise mentioned above (note 291), Wolf, *Curae philol. in Nov. Test.*, note on Acts xiii. 16, and many subsequent writers. I am rather disposed to think that it was Deyling who originated this view. For I have not met with a single instance among writers previous to him in which the *σεβόμενοι* are regarded as being the same as the "proselytes of the gate."

of fact however it is only this latter part of the statement that is correct, *the σεβόμενοι and the* נרי השער *having nothing whatever to do with each other.* Those Rabbinical designations are as yet entirely foreign to the usage of the Mishna, where the only distinction met with is that between the גֵּר pure and simple and the גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב. The former means a Gentile who has been converted to Judaism, the latter again corresponds to what in the Old Testament is understood by a גֵּר, namely a stranger dwelling in the land of Israel (see note 292). But with a view to greater clearness and precision it afterwards came to be the practice to substitute for גר the expression גר צדק (a *righteous* stranger, *i.e.* a stranger who observes the law), and for גר תושב the words גר שער, *a stranger dwelling in the gates or in the land of Israel* (according to Ex. xx. 10; Deut. v. 14, xiv. 21, xxiv. 14). The latter therefore corresponds exactly to what in the Old Testament is simply called a גר. It would appear however that the expression גר שער is as yet no less foreign to Talmudic usage. At least in all the passages from the Talmud that are quoted in any of the literature with which I happen to be acquainted, the only expression ever used is גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב.[294] It is not till we come down to the Rabbinical writers of the Middle Ages that we meet with the expression גר שער as well.[295] If then we confine ourselves to Talmudic usage the question is simply reduced to this, whether

[294] So above all in *Sanhedrin* 96b: "Naeman (2 Kings v. 1) was a גר תושב; Nebuzaradan (2 Kings xxv. 8) was a גר צבק" (Buxtorf, *Lex. Chald.* col. 410). Similarly in all the other passages from the Talmud quoted, for example, by Buxtorf (*Lex.* under גר), Levy (*Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under גר), Hamburger (*Real-Enc.* art. "Proselyt") and others, the only expressions met with are גר תושב and גר צדק.

[295] When one peruses modern treatises on this subject, one is led to suppose that the expression גר שער was quite current. But throughout the whole of the literature with which I am acquainted I have not been able to discover more than *one* solitary instance of it, namely R. Bechai (belonging to the thirteenth century) in his *Kad ha-Kemach* as quoted in Buxtorf's *Lex.* col. 410.

the *σεβόμενοι* are to be regarded as identical with the גרי תושב. Now with regard to these latter the Talmud states that they were those who had come under an obligation to observe "*the seven precepts of the children of Noah.*"[296] Under this designation the Talmudic doctors include all those precepts that were already binding upon mankind at large before Abraham and outside of his family (in other words, the "children of Noah").[297] If then compliance with these latter

[296] *Aboda sara* 64b: "What is a גר תושב? According to R. Meir, every one who, in the presence of the Chaberim, comes under an obligation to abstain from all idolatrous worship. But the doctors say: Every one that accepts the seven precepts which were accepted by the descendants of Noah (בני נח). Others say: A גר תושב is a stranger who eats the carcase of an animal that has died a natural death (נבלות, Lev. xxii. 8; Deut. xiv. 21); who observes all the precepts of the law except that which forbids the eating of fallen meat." See also Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 409. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. 941 (art. "Proselyt"). Slevogt, *De proselytis Judaeorum*, chap. xli., in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 842 (and here according to Maimonides). Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.*, 1st ed. vol. xii. p. 250. Delitzsch, also in Herzog, 2nd ed. vol. xii. p. 300.

[297] *Sanhedrin* 56b top: "There were seven precepts given to the descendants of Noah (בני נח): (1) דינין (to obey those in authority), (2) ברכת השם (to sanctify the name of God), (3) עבודה זרה (to abstain from idolatry), (4) גלוי עריות (to commit no fornication), (5) שפיכות דמים (to do no murder), (6) גזל (not to steal), (7) אבר מן החי (not to eat living flesh, *i.e.* flesh with the blood in it)." For this same enumeration, see Tosefta, *Aboda sara* ix. In several passages of the Mishna (for example *Bereshith rabba*, chap. xvi. *fin.* given in Wünsche, *Der Midrash Bereshit rabba ins Deutsche übertragen*, 1881, p. 72) only the first six are enumerated as belonging to the Noachian precepts, which are further said to have been already given to Adam himself (see Levy, *Neuhebr. Wörterb.* under מצוה; Weber, *System der altsynagogalen palästinischen Theologie*, p. 253 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* art. "Noachiden," p. 864). Hence Maimonides affirms that the first six were given to Adam and that the sixth was added in Noah's time. Moreover mention is likewise made of thirty precepts that had been given to the Noachidae, but of which they only observed three (*Chullin* 92a bottom; see Waehner, *Antiqui Ebr.* ii. 163. Hamburger as above, p. 865). See in general, Slevogt, *De proselytis Judaeorum*, chap. xl. (in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 841 sq.). Fabricius, *Codex pseudepigr. Vet. Test.* i. 268 sqq. Deyling, *Observationes sacrae*, ii. No. 38, p. 464, ed. Lips. 1722 (also other literature mentioned there). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 40 sq. (also other literature mentioned there). Waehner, *Antiquitates Ebraeorum*, ii. p. 163 sq

was what was demanded of the גֵּר תּוֹשָׁב, *this can only mean that one who was not a Jew, but who lived permanently in the land of Israel, had at least to observe those precepts that were equally binding on the whole human race.* Of course this proved to be nothing more than a barren theory. For it is hardly likely that the Greeks and Romans who lived in Palestine would trouble themselves much about those Jewish regulations. So far then as practical life is concerned the so-called precepts for proselytes have no significance. They only represent a casuistical theory which was never reduced to actual practice.[298] From this therefore it is evident that the גרי תושב have no connection with the *σεβόμενοι τὸν θεόν*, just as it is further certain that what we know from history regarding these latter is utterly incompatible with the Rabbinical requirements in regard to the גרי תושב.

It would appear, according to the Talmud, that on the *occasion of admitting* proselytes strictly so called into the Jewish communion *three things were necessary:* (1) מִילָה, circumcision; (2) טְבִילָה, baptism, *i.e.* a bath with a view to Levitical purification; and (3) הַרְצָאַת דָּמִים, a sacrifice (literally, a gracious acceptance of blood). In the case of women only the last two were required.[299] After the destruction of the

Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.*, 1st ed. xii. 250. Delitzsch, also in Herzog, 2nd ed. xii. 300. Weber, *System*, etc. p. 253 sq. Hamburger, *Real-Enc.* ii. pp. 863–866 (art. "Noachiden").

[298] Besides, as the passage quoted from *Aboda sara* 64[b] shows, the theory was thrown together only in an off-hand way, it was not seriously thought out. A more careful comparison of the Old Testament regulations with regard to the גרים would have led to different results (see in general, Ex. xii. 43–50, xx. 10, xxii. 20, xxiii. 9, 12; Lev. xvii. 8, 10, 13, 15, xviii. 26, xix. 10, 33, 34, xx. 2, xxiv. 16–22; Num. xv. 14–16, xix. 10; Deut. v. 14, xiv. 21, xxiv. 14; Ezek. xiv. 7). We see then that the Jewish doctors cannot have dealt with this matter *ex professo*. Further, the various answers given to the question raised in *Aboda sara* 64[b], go to show that we have to do merely with a view incidentally expressed and not with a firmly established practice.

[299] *Keritoth* 81[a] (according to other editions 9a; it is by way of serving

temple, as a matter of course the sacrifice was discontinued also. In the Mishna all three are presupposed as being already of long standing;[300] nay for Rabbinical Judaism they are so much matters of course that, even apart from any explicit testimony, we should have had to assume that they were already currently practised in the time of Christ. For as no Jew could be admitted into fellowship with Israel except through circumcision, so it was quite as much a matter of course that a Gentile, who as such was unclean, seeing that he was not in the habit of observing the regulations with regard to Levitical purity, should be required, on entering into such fellowship, to take the bath of Levitical purification. But similarly, a Gentile as such was also מְחֻסַּר כַּפָּרָה, "in need of atonement," and con-

as an explanation of Mishna, *Kerithoth* ii. 1): "Your fathers entered not otherwise into the covenant than by *circumcision*, *washing with water*, and the *offering* (literally, gracious acceptance) *of blood*." See the passage also in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. p. 34 of London edition), in Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe*, p. 20, and in Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüdischen Proselytentaufe*, p. 138. *Jebamoth* 46a: לעולם אין גר עד שימול ויטבול, "A proselyte only becomes so after he has been circumcised and has been washed with water. . . . With regard to a proselyte who has been circumcised but not washed with water, R. Eliezer says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding; for we find that, in the case of our fathers, they were circumcised but not washed with water. With regard to one who has been washed with water but not circumcised, R. Joshua says that he is a proselyte notwithstanding, for we find that, in the case of our mothers, they were washed with water but not circumcised. But the doctors say that neither the one nor the other is a proselyte." See the passage also in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. p. 35 of London edition), in Bengel as above, p. 22, and in Schneckenburger as above, p. 136 sq. Founding on those Talmudical prescriptions, Maimonides likewise affirms that three things are necessary, טבילה, מילה and קרבן, it being expressly stated that the two last are binding upon women. See the passage in Selden, *De Synedriis*, book i. chap. iii. (vol. i. pp. 37–40 of London edition). Also in general Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.* note on Matt. iii. 6. Slevogt, *De proselytis*, chap. xi. (Ugolini, xxii. 815). Danz, *Baptismus proselytorum*, chap. xvi. (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test.* etc. p. 250). Carpzov, *Apparatus*, p. 43. Leyrer in Herzog's *Enc.* xii. 242 sqq.

[300] Circumcision and washing with water (baptism), *Pesachim* viii. 8 = *Edujoth* v. 2. Sacrifice, *Kerithoth* ii. 1.

tinued to be so "until blood was sprinkled for him."[301] Strange to say, with regard to one of the things here in question, namely the *baptism* or washing with water, the view has prevailed among Christian scholars since the beginning of the eighteenth century, that it was not observed as yet in our Lord's time. Originally it was for dogmatic reasons that this was maintained, while in modern times nothing but an imperfect acquaintance with the facts of the case can account for the way in which the once dominant prejudice has been allowed to linger on.[302] Surely every one in the least acquainted with Pharisaic Judaism must know how frequently a native Jew was compelled, in accordance with the enactments of Lev. xi.–xv. and Num. xix., to take a bath with a view to Levitical purification. As Tertullian justly observes,

[301] *Kerithoth* ii. 1.

[302] Lists of the literature of this subject are given by Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, p. 46 sq. Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe*, pp. 1–13. Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alten der jüdischen Proselyten-Taufe*, pp. 4–32. Winer, *Realwörtb.* ii. 286 (art. "Proselyten"). Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 245. De Wette, *Lehrbuch der hebräisch-jüdischen Archäologie*, 4th ed. (1864) p. 376. Meyer's *Commentary*, note on Matt. iii. 6. The following works deserve special mention: Lightfoot, *Horae Hebr.*, note on Matt. iii. 6. Danz, *Baptismus proselytorum Judaicus* (in Meuschen, *Nov. Test. ex Talmude illustratum*, pp. 233–287). Idem, *Antiquitas baptismi initiationis Israelitarum vindicata* (also in Meuschen, pp. 287–305). Carpzov, *Apparatus historico-criticus*, pp. 46–50. Bengel, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselytentaufe*, Tübingen 1814. Schneckenburger, *Ueber das Alter der jüd. Proselyten-Taufe und deren Zusammenhang mit dem Johanneischen und christlichen Ritus*, Berlin 1828. Lübkert, *Theol. Stud. u. Krit.* 1835, p. 690 sqq. Winer, *Realwörtb.* ii. 285 sq. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 1st ed. xii. pp. 242–249. Delitzsch, *ibid.* 2nd ed. xii. pp. 297–299. Zezschwitz, *System der christl. kirchl. Katechetik*, i. 216 sqq. Edersheim, *The Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah* (2nd ed. 1884), pp. 745 747. Of the above, Lightfoot, Danz, Bengel, Delitzsch, Zezschwitz, Edersheim are in favour of the high antiquity of the baptism of proselytes, the others are opposed to it; but none of them have influenced modern opinion on the subject so much as Schneckenburger.

"Judaeus quotidie lavat quia quotidie inquinatur."[303] But a Gentile, not being in the habit of observing those regulations with regard to Levitical purity, would as such be unclean and that as a simple matter of course. In that case how was it possible that he could be admitted into Jewish communion without his having first of all subjected himself to a טְבִילָה (a Levitical "bath of purification")? This general consideration is of itself so conclusive that there is no need to lay any very great stress upon individual testimonies. But we may further add, that it is an unmistakeable fact that, in the Mishna, the taking of the "bath" by the proselyte is already presupposed as an established and authoritative practice.[304] In like manner the celebrated passage from Arrian (first half of the second century of our era) cannot, in my opinion, be otherwise under-

[303] Tertullian, *De baptismo*, chap. xv.

[304] *Pesachim* viii. 8 (=*Edujoth* v. 2): "A mourner is at liberty to partake of the Passover lamb that very evening after he has washed, but not so with regard to other holy sacrifices. . . . If a Gentile should happen to be circumcised on the day previous to the Passover, then, says the school of Shammai, he is at liberty (on that same day) to wash and, in the evening, partake of the Passover lamb (טובל ואוכל את פסחו לערב); but the school of Hillel says: whoever comes from being circumcised is like one who comes from a grave" (from touching a dead body). According to Gabler, the proselyte's bath mentioned here was prescribed "because the proselyte was defiled by the act of circumcision (!), and because among the Jews an unclean person was strictly speaking forbidden to take part in the Passover meal" (Gabler, *Journal für auserlesene theologische Literatur*, second part of the third vol., Nürnberg 1807, pp. 436–440). Similarly Bengel, *Proselytentaufe*, p. 90, note. Schneckenburger, p. 116 sqq. Winer, *Realwörtb.* ii. 286. Leyrer, xii. 246. If this notion of a defilement caused by circumcision were correct, then the prescription as to the bath would apply to every proselyte without distinction, no matter whether he was circumcised on the 4th of Nisan or at any other time. But the truth is the bath is presupposed as a matter of course, for the simple reason that a Gentile as such was unclean; and the only point in dispute is whether an exception was made in favour of one who was circumcised on the 14th of Nisan, so as to admit of his being treated as one who was unclean only for a *single* day in order that he might not be disqualified for joining in the Passover feast.

stood than as referring to the baptism of proselytes.[305] Again, the fourth book of the *Sibylline Oracles*, the Jewish origin of which is at least probable, insists on converted Gentiles being baptized as an outward token of their conversion.[306] The two last-mentioned testimonies are specially noteworthy on this account, that they speak only of the baptism and say nothing whatever about the circumcision. From this it follows that even in those cases where *full* admission to the fellowship of Israel had not taken place, the baptism at least was regarded as necessary. In presence of all those arguments the silence of Philo and Josephus on which so much stress has been laid is of no consequence whatever. For as yet no one has ever been able to point out a single passage in which those writers were necessarily called upon to mention the matter. Then in modern times some have gone the length of admitting that proselytes, on joining the Jewish communion, had

or whether in this instance as well the rule was enforced which required him to be treated as one who was unclean in the higher degree, and therefore for a period of seven days ("like one who comes from a grave," according to Num. xix.). Comp. Delitzsch as above, xii. 299.

[305] Arrian, *Dissertat. Epicteti*, ii. 9: Ὅταν τινα ἐπαμφοτερίζοντα εἴδωμεν, εἰώθαμεν λέγειν· οὐκ ἔστιν Ἰουδαῖος, ἀλλ' ὑποκρίνεται. Ὅταν δ' ἀναλάβῃ τὸ πάθος τὸ τοῦ βεβαμμένου καὶ ᾠρημένου, τότε καὶ ἔστι τῷ ὄντι καὶ καλεῖται Ἰουδαῖος. Here Arrian seeks to show that a man can claim to be a true philosopher only when his practice is in accordance with his principles. He intimates that there was something analogous to this in the case of the Jews. If a man calls himself a Jew without living as such, he is not recognised as a Jew. "But if any one adopts the mode of life required of one who has been baptized and elected (received into religious fellowship), then is he really a Jew and entitled to be called such." The figurative sense of βεβαμμένου (initiated) is here quite as improbable as the notion that Arrian confounds Jews with Christians. Comp. especially the exhaustive treatment of the matter in Bengel, pp. 91–99. But Schneckenburger's interpretation: "the πάθος of one who must regularly bathe himself" (p. 86, and in general pp. 78–89), is precluded by the use of the *perfect*.

[306] *Orac. Sibyll.* iv. 164.

to take a bath of Levitical purification. But this they think was something different from "baptism."[307] Unfortunately, however, no one is able to say wherein the difference lies. The truth is, it lies only in the German expression. For in Hebrew they are, as regards both the name and the thing, one and the same, namely a טְבִילָה, and, so far as the essence of this latter is concerned, it mattered very little whether it was accompanied with a larger or a smaller amount of liturgical ceremonial.[308]

The *obligations and rights of the proselytes* have been defined with great minuteness and detail by the Jewish doctors.[309] Speaking generally it was regarded, according to orthodox Pharisaic views, as a simple matter of course that they should *observe the whole law* (Gal. v. 3), and so also in particular with regard to the sacred tribute.[310] But the doctors have

[307] So for example Winer, *Realwörtb.* ii. 286. Leyrer in Herzog's *Real-Enc.* xii. 247. Keil, *Bibl. Archäol.*, 2nd ed. (1875) p. 341. Besides these also Schneckenburger, pp. 176, 184 sq.

[308] For a description of the rite as observed in post-Talmudic times, see for example Buxtorf, *Lex.* col. 407 sq. Slevogt, *De prosclytis*, chap. xiii. (in Ugolini, *Thes.* xxii. 817 sq.). Delitzsch in Herzog's *Real-Enc.*, 2nd ed. xii. 297. The most essential thing there was the presence of witnesses, which we may confidently assume would be regarded as no less necessary in pre-Talmudic times as well. And what is more, the Talmud, so far as I am aware, contains as yet no precise account of the ceremonial. It is therefore purely gratuitous to assert that the טבילה mentioned in the Talmud is different from that mentioned in the Mishna. On the other hand, it is correct to say that *the baptism of John and Christian baptism* are essentially different from that of the Jewish proselytes, and that because the two former were not intended to impart *Levitical* purity, but merely to serve as a symbol of *moral* cleansing. But of course the choice of this symbol was suggested by the practice of the Jews in regard to washings.

[309] For the passages in the Mishna, see note 292, above. A collection of material from the Talmud and Midrash is given in the tractate *Gerim*, to be found in the *Septem libri Talmudici parvi Hierosolymitani*, Frankfurt-am-Ma. 1851, and edited by Raphael Kirchheim.

[310] *Bikkurim* i. 4; *Shekalim* i. 3, 6; *Pea* iv. 6; *Challa* iii. 6; *Chullin*

here taxed their ingenuity in the way of carefully laying down certain limitations, especially in regard to the *terminus a quo* at which the obligation comes to be in force. Only those portions of the proselyte's earnings were liable for tribute which fell under the category of liability after his conversion.[311] Brothers who were born previous to their mother's conversion were not subject to the law regarding levirate marriage.[312] Then maidens who were born before their mother's conversion were not to be bound by the law given in Deut. xxii. 13–21.[313] This latter regulation may of itself serve to show how, along with the limitation of obligations, there was also at the same time a limitation of rights. Then again it was only such female proselytes as were less than three years and a day old at the time of the mother's conversion that, with respect to numerous matrimonial rights, were on a footing of equality with native Jewish women.[314] Further, female proselytes were on no account to be at liberty to contract marriage with priests, nor were the daughters of proselytes to be allowed to do so except in those instances in which one of the parents happened to be an Israelite by birth, in which case the privilege extended to the tenth generation.[315] On the other hand, proselyte women might marry a person that had been emasculated or mutilated, a thing which, according to Deut. xxiii. 2, native Jewesses were debarred from doing.[316] Then the legal enactment to the effect that, if any one through carelessness happened to strike a woman in such a way as to cause abortion he was to give compensation, did not apply to the case of proselyte women.[317] But, on the other hand, the

[311] *Pea* iv. 6; *Challa* iii. 6; *Chullin* x. 4.
[312] *Jebamoth* xi. 2.
[313] *Kethuboth* iv. 3.
[314] *Kethuboth* i. 2, 4, iii. 1, 2.
[315] *Jebamoth* vi. 5; *Kiddushin* iv. 7; *Bikkurim* i. 5.
[316] *Jebamoth* viii. 2.
[317] *Baba kamma* v. 4.

law with reference to the drinking of the jealousy water (Num. v. 11 sqq.) applied to female proselytes as well.[318]

It is precisely the care with which those restrictions have been framed that is so well calculated to show that, *in regard to obligations and rights, proselytes were regarded as being in all essential respects on an equality with native Israelites.* At the same time the gulf that lay between a born Gentile and a genuine descendant of Abraham could never be bridged over. A proselyte was never allowed to call the fathers of Israel "his" fathers;[319] while, in the order of rank in the theocracy, a proselyte occupies a lower place even than a nathin.[320] Although with characteristic humaneness the Jewish law, appealing to Ex. xxii. 20, forbids any one ever to be so unkind as to remind the son of a proselyte of the past ways of his fathers,[321] still, on the whole, proselytes were never held in the same estimation as native Jews. What Rabbi Judah presupposes with respect to the proselytes in Rekem, that they must have been remiss in the observance of the law,[322] probably represented, and that not altogether without reason, the average opinion held regarding them, and accordingly there are frequent complaints about them in the Talmud.

According to the Deuteronomic legislation there were two nations, the Ammonites and the Moabites, that were never

[318] *Edujoth* v. 6.

[319] *Bikkurim* i. 4: "A proselyte offers his firstlings without repeating the confession, Deut. xxvi. 3 sqq., because he is not at liberty to say, Give us what Thou hast sworn to *our* fathers. But if his mother happens to be of Israel, in that case he repeats the confession. When such proselyte prays by himself he uses the words, The God of the fathers of Israel. And when he is in the synagogue he uses the words, The God of *your* fathers. But if his mother be of Israel he says, The God of *our* fathers."

[320] *Horajoth* iii. 8: "A priest (in point of rank) takes precedence of a Levite, a Levite of an Israelite, an Israelite of a bastard, a bastard of a נְתִין, a nathin of a proselyte, and a proselyte of an emancipated slave."

[321] *Baba mezia* iv. 10.

[322] *Nidda* vii. 3.

to be admitted into communion with Israel, no, not even in the tenth generation (Deut. xxiii. 4). It is said that, apropos of this enactment, the question was once debated in the time of Gamaliel II., whether an Ammonitish proselyte who might wish to join the communion of the Jews should be allowed to do so. Gamaliel decided in the negative, while R. Joshua took the affirmative view on the ground that the Ammonites had long ceased to exist. The view of R. Joshua was homologated by the learned doctors.[323]

[323] *Jadajim* iv. 4.

END OF DIV. II. VOL. II.

**BIBLIOLIFE**

Old Books Deserve a New Life
www.bibliolife.com

Did you know that you can get most of our titles in our trademark **EasyScript**™ print format? **EasyScript**™ provides readers with a larger than average typeface, for a reading experience that's easier on the eyes.

Did you know that we have an ever-growing collection of books in many languages?

Order online:
www.bibliolife.com/store

Or to exclusively browse our **EasyScript**™ collection:
www.bibliogrande.com

At BiblioLife, we aim to make knowledge more accessible by making thousands of titles available to you – quickly and affordably.

Contact us:
BiblioLife
PO Box 21206
Charleston, SC 29413

Made in the USA
Middletown, DE
23 November 2015

BIBLIOBAZA

T5-CCW-267

9 781140 420491